The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE war is over, but nobody would say we yet have peace except in the superficial sense that the guns are silent. Long ago, in a time of upheaval, Sir John Selden wrote: "Though we had peace, yet 'twill be a great while ere things be settled: though the wind lie, yet after the storm the sea will work a great while". What he lived through was in comparison no more than a storm in a tea-cup, and his words are true now in a degree he could never have conceived. Perhaps it is just as well that we are running into great difficulties right at the start of the work of building peace. We might otherwise have fallen victims to the over-optimism which was the immediate and futile reaction after the war of 1914-18. As Mr. Sumner Welles says in *The Time for Decision,* "The high strain of emotional idealism of the autumn of 1918 was soon lost in the purely material and exaggeratedly nationalistic reaction of every country of the world". The danger is not that we shall wallow in that sort of idealism but that we shall lose all idealism whatsoever and become cynical. Some people seem already to be drifting into a kind of fatalism, being convinced, like Mr. H. G. Wells, that there is no way out or around or through the *impasse*. Many stood up bravely enough to the anxieties of war-time when they could find relief in doing something close to hand which needed urgently to be done. They are not sure that they could stand years of international bickering, such as we knew in the interval between the wars, made still more menacing and hideous now by the overhanging threat of the atomic bomb and the promise of worse to come. If that is the only kind of peace they are ever to know they can almost welcome Mr. Wells' prophecy that "the end of everything we call life is close at hand and cannot be long delayed". In such a time as this there are some words in Sir Charles Oman's book *On the Writing of History* which are worth recalling. He remarks that in 1493 the historical perspective of Christendom was black in the extreme. Everywhere there was gloom and hopelessness typified by Dürer's *Dance of Death*. But we turn on a few years, and by a strange cataclysm of the human mind the world is full of explosive ideals, moral, philosophical, cultural, social and religious. It may be that we are living on the eve of one of the great creative ages of history. The Christian cannot believe, at any rate, that the world is

in the hand of some malign power hurrying man irresistibly to his fate. It is still within man's power to choose whether Mr. Wells' vision of doom shall be realized or whether we, in our time, shall see the dawn of a new era. But man must choose—and choose quickly.

* * *

THE controversy about sharing the secrets of the atomic bomb has aroused almost as much misgiving as the announcement of its discovery and use. Debates, such as those which have recently taken place both in the House of Commons and outside, serve to accentuate the deep cleavages in outlook among the nations, which have yet to be bridged. By the time this number of the *Quarterly* is published, Mr. Attlee and Mr. Truman may perhaps have formulated a policy with regard to the atomic bomb which will be acceptable to Russia and the other powers. If so, the multitudes of ordinary folk will be breathing a little more freely.

That the secret of atomic energy cannot be kept for long is apparent. If others learn it, it will not necessarily be by treachery. Some authorities suggest that the main facts are already known, and that what is being kept back is the technique of manufacture. Discussion has been somewhat confused by recriminations about Russia's reticence concerning her secret weapons during the war, and by the argument twice expounded by Mr. Churchill that America may look forward to four years of supremacy during which time the international order for the future can be settled. The Russians are expressing the opinion that possession of the secret is being used by America as a coercive factor in negotiations.

We wonder whether the real issue, after all, lies deeper. Is this simply a matter of controlling a great weapon of destruction? If atomic energy can only be used to destroy, then a policy which serves to goad those who do not possess it to make redoubled efforts to obtain it, seems to be sheer folly. The Security Council of the United Nations is the proper body if international control is the only consideration.

The fact is, however, that the discovery is fraught with possibilities of a new source of power in industry and for the creation of wealth. Although experts inform us that it will be years before atomic energy can be thus harnessed, they are by no means certain, and there is no telling how much that vague period will be shortened by the concentration of the finest brains and skill on the development of this new power for practical and constructive tasks. There is every reason to believe that such intense application of thought is now being given to the matter.

The nations which are first in the field will have an enormous advantage over their commercial rivals. The priority we enjoyed in this country, due to our rapid exploitation of coal, ushered in a great period of prosperity, which only began to wane when other

nations caught up with us and, indeed, overtook us in the process of industrialization. It would not be surprising if we had at least one eye on the regaining of such an advantage through the use of this new force.

Such a surmise is not so fanciful as it may at first appear, for evidence is not lacking that economic considerations have been for a long time the dominating influence in the foreign policies of the nations and certainly of the great powers.

For Christians the discussion must be lifted to a different level. We rejoice that our own denominational leaders were the first to protest against the use of atomic bombs and to urge upon the Government the need for international control.

That is as far as it is possible to go in negative action. Protest, however, must be implemented by constructive thinking. We liked the line of thought indicated in an article by the Rev. Norman Goodall, that here was a revelation by God to man of another of the secrets of His Universe to be received with gratitude. This is no pious way of escape from the sense of guilt and self-condemnation occasioned by the use of the bomb, but rather a recall to the sound New Testament truth that the gifts of nature are, in fact, gifts of grace, to be held in trust and handled in reverent stewardship for the good of all men.

Whatever arrangements may be reached, the control of atomic energy will depend ultimately on a firm loyalty to that Christian truth; in this alone will be found the only sure guarantee against the abuse of this new and awful power.

* * *

THE exigencies of the war have brought us into much closer fellowship with our brethren in the Congregational churches of the United States of America. The closer association began with the spontaneous and generous help which our friends over there sent to us in our time of need, and this was followed by the appointment of Mrs. Frieda Demarest, M.A., as representative of the American churches in this country. Her presence and her work have been of immense encouragement to us. What began in a gesture of friendship, and developed into a valued piece of constructive war-time service, has every likelihood of becoming a permanent part of the policy and work of the two denominations. The visit of Mrs. Hawley Willson, Secretary of the War Victims and Services Committee, has been followed by that of an important deputation of seven leaders of American Congregationalism to our Churches. Moreover, the Triple Jubilee Celebrations were attended by Dr. Russell Stafford, Chairman of the American Board, so that an important contact was made also in the interests of the missionary enterprise. All this will receive a response from our side in the

visit of Dr. Berry to the United States, which is planned for next spring.

The newly formed International Relations Committee of the Union has other plans under discussion, parts of which are already in operation. Four American Social Service workers are giving great help to some of our London Ministers and Churches; a young American minister, the Rev. Henry Rust, is doing fine work in Coventry. As conditions become more favourable, it is hoped that students and ministers may go from this side to the States for a mutual sharing of experience. Before long there will be a greater interchange of literature. There is no thought of making this an exclusive arrangement between American Congregationalists and ourselves, but rather of building on this foundation a world fellowship of Congregationalists which will be real and valuable in itself and also effective in the World Council of Churches.

The next meeting of the International Congregational Council, which it is hoped will be held in America in 1947, is likely to be of more than usual interest.

* * *

We did not like the emphasis on gambling made in a recent discussion broadcast in the series "Bridge on the Air". The members of the sort of "brains trust", who conducted this particular programme, gave a unanimous verdict that stakes were necessary if the game was to be properly played. The main argument urged in support of this opinion was that stakes curb the selfish and reckless player—an argument which will not stand examination either on grounds of morality or sportsmanship. The increase in gambling, in this country, is sufficient menace both to private and public morals without the encouragement directly or indirectly of the august and powerful advocacy of the B.B.C.

* * *

Mr. Bevin has just made his statement in the House concerning the Palestine problem and announcing American co-operation. He has declared that he will stake his political future on finding a solution to this, the most difficult problem he has ever had to tackle. We wish him all success, though regretting the rather theatrical boast which is a little ill-judged. Mr. Bevin will have the sympathy of right-thinking people in his appeal for the laying aside of all racial prejudice and in his refusal to countenance any solution by violence. Unfortunately he cannot count on the co-operation of all interested parties. The American Zionist Emergency Council, for example, is letting loose a flood of propaganda directly inciting the Jews to violence and lawlessness, and calling for "a mighty outburst of indignation against the callousness and duplicity practised upon the helpless Jewish people by the British Government". "Britain and our own Government", says the Council, "must know that the

American people will not be silent while the solemn pledges made to the Jews are scrapped to appease pro-fascist Arab chieftains". Such language contributes little enough to the solution of a problem so complex and difficult that it will never be solved at all except by statesmanship of a high order and a spirit of conciliation in all the parties involved. It is perfectly legitimate for anyone to believe that Zionism is the only right solution of the Jewish problem, but calumnies of this kind and plain incitements to violence are not legitimate. We believe they will arouse the indignation of many Jews (including Zionists) in this country and in America, and if the level-headed in Jewry can restrain these hot-heads they will have helped Mr. Bevin to redeem the mortgage on his political future.

* * *

WITHIN recent years a good many reports on evangelism have been issued by various sections of the Church, but none has equalled in thoroughness and freshness that published a few months ago by a commission of the Church of England under the title *Towards the Conversion of England*. The commission was appointed at the end of 1943 by the Archbishops, and William Temple attended the first session and gave the introductory address. The book is appropriately described on the cover as "A plan dedicated to the memory of Archbishop William Temple", and his words and spirit pervade it. Though some points of the report are especially relevant to the situation and opportunities of the Anglican Church, there is much which should be carefully studied by the Free Churches, and it is good to see that the Commission envisages a great deal of united effort by all Christian people. While we do not suggest that it is the most important part of the report, we would comment on the section concerned with the Church's use of advertising. Here the authors break new ground and show imagination. They list eight agencies of propaganda, and remark that advertising is the one which most people would hesitate to ask the Churches to employ. In that they are probably right, for many would fear that the Church would suffer a loss of dignity and would cheapen itself. But it is surely obvious that the Church *must* advertise, and the problem is to discover the means by which an impact can be made on a public used to modern advertising methods, without resort to stunting. It may be that the best way to command attention would be by some kind of advertising which would be in complete contrast to accepted methods. There are, however, certain basic principles which underlie all advertising, and the Commission did not hesitate to seek expert advice—indeed, they say that advice was offered "almost unsought, by eminent practitioners professionally engaged in the successful publicity of Government departments and commercial industries".

The Commission is bold enough to think of advertising on a large scale, and contemplates expenditure in terms which make us gasp a little. They point out that the Ministry of Food spends in Press and poster advertising something in the region of £500,000 a year. Even more is spent on the Savings Campaign. In peacetime the larger commercial enterprises range about £300,000 a year, and there are campaigns estimated to cost half a million a year. "We foresee the need to assess the total cost over a long period covered by a series of successive and accumulative campaigns; for it is not to be expected that anything approaching the maximum achievement can be effected in less than, say, a generation. . . . We are advised that the cost of this First Five Years' Campaign proposal should develop to the rate of about £200,000 a year; and by the end of the first year of its inception the expenditure might reach half that amount". The nation-wide campaign would be undertaken by a Publicity Department which would be added to the Publications Board of the Church Assembly.

In the meantime, what can the individual church do about it? Press advertising on any scale worth-while is out of the question. (The notice advertising Sunday's Services may interest churchgoers, but certainly does nothing to arrest the attention of outsiders.) There are two main avenues left. One is the cinema screen. The great combines flatly refuse to give a church a place among the advertisements flashed on the screens, though independent proprietors may be more helpful. The other method which catches the eye of the outsider is the striking and strategically placed poster. But what is the poster to be like? A conventional invitation to services and an assurance of a warm welcome won't get far. We know of a church which called in the services of a reputable firm of advertising agents. They were immensely intrigued, for they had never been asked to advertise a church before! They entered into the project with enthusiasm, and showed some understanding of what could and could not be done. But when they got down to the job they were badly baffled.

Within our Congregational churches there must be advertising agents of ability, and certainly there are business men who understand the art of publicity and who have ingenuity. They would do a real service if they could produce ideas for posters which would make the non-churchgoer stop, and look, and think, and arouse his curiosity enough to make him wonder if he had stumbled on something sufficiently interesting and relevant to his own life to warrant further investigation. If the right kind of wording could be found, professional artists would no doubt soon provide striking designs, and the same posters, with necessary local details added, could be used anywhere.

* * *

When Sir Stafford Cripps returned in triumph from Moscow his was a name to be conjured with. With the blaze of that limelight still upon him he left on his mission to India, and there was a pretty general feeling that at last the baffling problem of India would be settled. When he returned without having achieved a settlement no reasonable person laid the failure at his door, but people began to realize that he was only human after all, and his stupendous prestige suffered a temporary eclipse. Nevertheless, he still counts for a great deal, and will probably count for a great deal more in the future. Christians can indeed be thankful that a man in the very forefront of public and political life nails his colours to the mast as fearlessly as does Sir Stafford. It is not the fashion to do so in these days. Under the title *Towards Christian Democracy* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), Sir Stafford has set down some of the political convictions based on his Christian faith. Though it is not anywhere stated, we suspect the book is a collection of speeches delivered on various occasions. We do, in fact, recognize one which was given at our own May Meetings. Inevitably the book lacks unity and is somewhat scrappy. Sometimes, too, Sir Stafford oversimplifies. He remarks, for example: "If ever we are in doubt as to how we should act in particular circumstances, social, political, or economic, we can find the answer by reference to the moral laws which He taught us". But can we? Is it as simple as that? Is not the perennial difficulty of those who really want to apply Christian principles to concrete situations that they cannot always see what is required of them amidst the complexities of modern life with all its conflicting loyalties? Even when we succeed in discounting selfish considerations (as we constantly do *not*) it is by no means easy to see precisely what action Christian principles require of us in every case. Probably Sir Stafford himself would not claim that there is much new in what he says. The important thing is that Sir Stafford, being the man he is, has said it.

* * *

Our correspondent writes: Can good pictures be made to order? Can art be made subject to propaganda and still be art? Robert Frost has said that a poem "is never a put-up job. It begins as a lump in the throat, a sense of wrong, a home-sickness, a love-sickness". Is it the same with a picture? The exhibition of National War Pictures at the Royal Academy gave rise to these queries, for it is the result of the activity of the War Artists' Advisory Committee, set up by the Ministry of Information to make "an artistic record of the war in all its aspects". Let it be said at once that the Committee has succeeded in this assignment: warfare on all the British fronts, in the air as well as on land and sea, and the work of civil defence, fire fighting, munitions, and the Red Cross, are all included in what is a worthy historical record—and there

are even one or two horrible pictures of Belsen. Many of the official artists were of such standing that meritorious work was assured. Two of them, to quote the Catalogue,

> lost their lives. Eric Ravilions was killed flying over Iceland. . . . Albert Richards, after dropping by parachute on D-Day and laying aside his sketchbook in order to command his unit in the Caen area, was killed by a mine near the river Maas at the age of twenty-six.

Among the exhibits which stand out in the memory are Mr. Cundall's reconstruction of the withdrawal from Dunkirk, the late R. G. Eves's portraits of Field-Marshal Alexander and General Auchinleck, Mr. Eric Kennington's many portraits, Dame Laura Knight's and Mr. Stanley Spencer's munition pictures. Mr. Meredith Frampton's one exhibit, a group with Sir Ernest Gowers and two companions, is pleasing, but I must confess that the paintings of Mr. Henry Moore and Mr. Graham Sutherland left me quite cold. Readers of this journal will be interested in Mr. R. V. Pitchforth's "City Temple Church", an unrecognizable interior, Sir Muirhead Bone's "St. Bride's and the City after the Fire", and the many paintings of Coventry Cathedral. Some of the busts were already familiar: to his admirable bronze head of Mr. Maisky, Mr. Epstein has added a companion in a rugged Mr. Ernest Bevin.

Only about 1,000 of the Committee's over 5,000 works were on show, but it was quite enough: one longed for a peaceful landscape. But the collection as a whole will no doubt serve its purpose, and we hope nobody will be deterred by these words from seeing the Exhibition in whole or in part as it travels round the country. It is well that those who have lived in safety during the war years should see something of what war has done—and of the manifold service men and women have rendered, often with the greatest courage, devotion, and sacrifice.

* * *

Our July Editorial contained a paragraph on the difficulties of work among scattered country churches, and as an example we referred to the distances represented by a triangle in the county of Bucks. We have received a letter from the Rev. Gordon Abbott of Port Elizabeth, who says: "Let me hasten to superimpose upon your triangle a much larger S. African one. From A (Petrusville) to B (Queenstown), 190 miles: from A to C (Aberdeen), 180 miles: from B to C, 190 miles. In this triangle are 14 Congregational churches —1 European with 47 members, 2 African with 282 members, 11 coloured with 1,571 members. Total—14 churches, 1,800 members. Total staff—1 European minister (80 years old), 1 pastor, 2 evangelists (1 coloured and 1 African). As you remark, there is only one solution to problems like these—keen and consecrated young men, willing to rough it. Will the colleges provide any such?"

* * *

We do not attempt to conceal from ourselves the fact that many readers will pick up this issue of the *Quarterly* with at least a twinge of regret and, even before they have opened it, will murmur "Ichabod". The *Quarterly*, like most successful journals, was the work of one man who stamped his personality indelibly upon it. We, who are called upon to succeed Dr. Peel, have profound sympathy with those who wrote to him to say that they could see no reason for his retirement. We, most of all, could see every reason for his continuing indefinitely in the editorial chair! We pay our tribute to an editor whom we cannot hope to emulate. Dr. Peel brought to his task a great literary gift, ripe scholarship, and a wide knowledge of the world of men and books. He seemed to know everybody and everything. He was never deterred by fear or favour from saying what he thought. Now and again he said things in a way that some people found provoking, but, as Bernard Shaw points out, things may often just as well be left unsaid unless they are said in an irritating way, for nobody will take any notice! Readers who fear, with some reason, that the *Quarterly* will henceforth be *Hamlet* without the Prince, may rest assured that from time to time we shall do our best to persuade Dr. Peel to emerge from his "retirement" in order that he may enrich our pages by his learning and critical acumen and even, it may be, by more cricket stories from an apparently inexhaustible store. The denomination owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Peel for having given us a journal which can hold up its head in any company.

And now concerning ourselves. The Reviews and Shorter Notices, which have been one of the most valuable features of the *Quarterly*, will be in the hands of Dr. Nuttall. His reputation as a scholar and as a judge of books is well established. From him, and from the reviewers upon whom he will call, our readers may confidently expect the competent guidance they have received in the past.

The general editorial responsibility falls on two men whose chief (perhaps only!) qualification for the position is that they are working ministers who know something about the churches and their problems, and who are convinced that the *Quarterly* has a useful place to fill in the life of the denomination. We hope, too, that it will continue to command the interest and respect of many readers who belong to other denominations or none.

It seems to us that one of the great difficulties which confronts those responsible for the *Quarterly* is that it is intended to appeal to so many types of readers. One good Congregationalist, explaining why he was not a subscriber, remarked that if he wanted something solid he bought the *Hibbert Journal*, and if he desired to be amused he turned to *Punch*. He did not, we think, appreciate the vexatious problems which must often have confronted Dr. Peel during the

past twenty-three years. The *Quarterly* has to provide something which the learned (in colleges or elsewhere) will not regard as an insult to their intelligences. At the same time it has to avoid the dreadful reproach of being high-brow! It has to come down off the academic heights for the sake of those who have little Greek and less Hebrew. And it has to speak about theological and ecclesiastical matters in a way which can be understood by those who have had no theological training at all. Moreover, it will be pronounced dull if it has not a lighter note. In short, like Mr. Stiggins' moral pocket-handkerchiefs, it must combine amusement with instruction.

We are anxious to make the *Quarterly* as useful as possible to all types of readers, and shall welcome their suggestions, though we cannot promise to act on them all. We are not entirely devoid of ideas as to fresh features which may be introduced and new lines which may be explored, but we shall not hasten to make many innovations.

Both the editors will contribute to the Editorials, and those of our readers, who found the disentangling of J, E, and P a fascinating occupation, may find some diversion in assigning the paragraphs to their sources, T or C. We shall be glad, however, if no correspondent will write to say 'tis 'ard to sort them out or to suggest that too many Cookes spoil the broth. And, as a further favour, we beg that no one will write to us wittily about "The Two Leslies".

We will do our best to serve the denomination in the difficult and responsible task which has been allotted to us—one which we certainly did not seek. An American editor is said to have ascribed his exceptional longevity to the fact that he never expected to please anybody and never tried to. On the knowledge that, however much we try, we shall not be able to please *everybody*, we base a reasonable expectation of life!

* * *

We append some editorial paragraphs for which space could not be found in the last issue. Internal evidence alone would be adequate to prove that we have here a genuine fragment of P.

* * *

Did it not make us sick at heart Dr. H. Burn-Murdoch's *Church, Continuity and Unity* (Cambridge Press, 15s.) would make us boil with rage. Any preconceived view can be proved by picking and choosing from authorities, which is the author's practice from the New Testament downwards. Everything that does not support his view he calmly ignores, and even Lightfoot is patronized when he strays from Dr. Burn-Murdoch's way—much more P. T. Forsyth (Principal of "the Congregational Theological College" on p. xi and of "the Congregational Theological College at Hampstead" on p. 71), W. M. Macgregor, James Moffatt, and Dr. Carnegie Simp-

son. Sentences of Free Churchmen supporting Dr. Burn-Murdoch's contentions are triumphantly introduced, with no indication that they are far from representative.

The argument is the familiar one, and it is repeated *ad nauseam*. The Church which has continuity and with which all the other "Churches" (they have no right to the name) must unite is an episcopal Church, with a ministry ordained by bishops, and "divinely appointed" sacraments. Entry to it is by baptism (St. Paul, who thanked God he baptized none but Crispus and Gaius, "saw to the careful administration of the sacraments") and throughout the stress is on the outward element in the sacrament rather than the baptism of the Spirit. A baptized person is always a member of the Church, no matter what his life; an unbaptized cannot be, no matter how faithful a follower of Christ Jesus. This brought to mind a Lausanne Conference Committee, when we were urging that the Friends must have a place in the Church. Bishop Azariah strongly protested, saying membership without baptism would encourage "secret discipleship" and cause difficulties on the mission-field. He was answered by Archbishop Söderblom, who said the greatest enemy of the Church in Sweden was one who had been baptized.

Dr. Burn-Murdoch quotes—we hope the dots suggest he quotes incorrectly—a Congregational expositor of "two or three in my Name" thus:

> Modern Independency . . . has misunderstood the text . . . and has overlooked the fact that it is only the presence of the Word, Sacraments, and Apostolic Ministry with Dogmatics which can insure that the gathering together is in fact in Christ's name.

We have not the slightest idea what this can mean. Were the disciples gathered round Jesus a Church? Were those who met immediately after Pentecost? In what sense had they "the Word, Sacraments, and Apostolic Ministry with Dogmatics"? "By their fruits ye shall know them" and "He that doeth the will shall know the teaching" seem to us better ways of entering and adorning the Church than any sacrament, for they are the methods Jesus Himself commended.

For Dr. Burn-Murdoch "the priesthood of all believers" becomes "the priesthood of the baptized". We cannot imagine any greater disservice to the cause of Christian union than a book of this kind. It never seems to occur to the writer that the continuity he seeks is to be found in the faith and worship of a believing people. It is in the Church and not in its ministry that continuity is to be found. The Church could indeed exist without a ministry of the kind this volume magnifies. Has Dr. Burn-Murdoch never met groups of people fervent in worship, incessant in the service of

the Kingdom, who have had no ministry of ordained men but have been indeed and of a truth churches of the living God?

* * *

We like Dr. A. D. Lindsay's story (in *The Good and the Clever*) of the

> Genevan banker, who, when pressed to follow his wife and daughter into that company which chose as its title "The Oxford Groups", said firmly: *"Mon fils et moi—nous restons Cambridge".*

* * *

From an Indian paper we take this *"Government Litany"*, an anonymous "form of daily service for use in all departments of the Government of India". We are told that it is equally applicable to Government departments in this country.

> Let us pray.—O Lord, grant that this day we come to no decisions,
> Neither run into any kind of responsibility,
> But that all our doings may be so ordered as to establish
> New and quite unwarranted Departments,
> For ever and ever.—*Amen.*
>
> The prayer to be followed by the hymn:
>
> O Thou who seest all things below,
> Grant that Thy servants may go slow,
> That they may study to comply
> With regulations till they die.
>
> Teach us, Lord, to reverence,
> Committees more than commonsense,
> Impress our minds to make no plan,
> But pass the baby when we can.
>
> And when the tempter seeks to give
> Us feelings of initiative,
> Or when alone we go too far,
> Chastise us with a circular.
>
> Mid war and tumult, fire and storms,
> Confirm us, Lord, we pray with forms.
> Thus will Thy servants ever be
> A flock of perfect sheep for Thee.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: IS IT CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURE?

By E. C. Blackman, M.A.

The question whether the Old Testament has a right to a place in our Christian Bible would appear to be exercising the minds of serious people both inside and outside the churches. It is a proper question to raise, and cannot be answered with a dogmatic assertion that the Old Testament is, and always has been, Christian Scripture. It arises out of the larger question concerning God and His self-communication to man: Is there a Word of God to man, and if so, how is it communicated? In this context consideration of the status of the *O.T.* is very much in place, and may be no less fruitful of religious enrichment than it is evidence of religious concern. But let it be clear that the assessment of the claim of the *O.T.* to be regarded as authoritative for Christians—canonical Scripture bound up within the same covers as the *N.T.*—can only be done in the light of the consideration: Is the *O.T.* the Word of God?

This is different from the more purely historical question: Was the *O.T.* the Word of God to the Jews in the centuries before Christ? There may be genuine historical interest in the *O.T.*, just as there is legitimate literary, philological and ethical interest in it. But none of these is our present line of approach. We are not concerned (nor must we allow ourselves to be side-tracked!) with the question whether the *O.T.* contains mythology as well as history, or science as well as history; or whether *Esther* and *Judges* are fit for children to read. These questions are all relevant and should be dealt with frankly. The *O.T.* does use mythology and poetry as well as historical narrative and prophetic utterance to be the media of divine truth. Many of its statements are discredited by the results of modern scientific research; its account of the origin of human life, for example, in *Genesis* 1 and 2 has no value in the realm of biology, and its statements about the sun and stars are likewise antiquated by modern astronomy since Copernicus. In the sphere of ethics the moral standard of some parts of the *O.T.* must be pronounced unchristian or at least prechristian. Let all this be admitted, and not merely apologetically, by way of grudging submission to the rationalist objector, but openly, in the interest of that true rationalism which is critical in the highest sense of truth-seeking and truth-serving. Let this be admitted, for the sake of the Word of God itself. For such an admission clears the ground

for the main task, *viz.*, the determination of the essential religious value of the *O.T.* apart from its literary or historical value; its ability to mediate God to man, not merely to Jewish men living in Palestine between 2000 B.C. and 200 B.C.

Our concern then is with the overriding theological question: Is the *O.T.* the Word of God for our day? Can it as truly convey to our generation as it did to the ancient Jews the sense of the sovereign reality and majestic love of God? Only if this can be answered affirmatively is the *O.T.* in Christian estimation on the same level of authoritativeness as the *N.T.*

The first who clearly pronounced on the question of the meaning and authority of the *O.T.* was the leading Nonconformist of the 2nd century, Marcion. His solution was radical and ruthless. He declared that the *O.T.* was not Christian Scripture at all, and that it was a mistake for the Christian Church ever to have regarded it as such. That this had occurred was due to a tragic misunderstanding of the Gospel from the very beginning. Even the apostles, except Paul, had fallen a prey to it, but Marcion felt himself commissioned in his generation (140 A.D.) to restore the original Gospel. The *O.T.* has nothing to do with the Gospel, and was not even a preparation for it, he said. He buttressed this declaration with his dualism of the Redeemer God, who is the father of Jesus Christ, as distinct from the God who created the world and inspired the writing of the *O.T.* This argument, grotesque as it is, was persuasive in Marcion's day. But while we note the inadequacy of Marcion's reasoning we may learn one thing from him. His approach to the problem of the *O.T.* was partly right. He asked the right question, even though he answered it wrongly. The question he asked was: Does the *O.T.* point out the saving acts of God the Redeemer? We may be thankful that the main body of Christians (it is a little premature to call them "orthodox" at this date) held on to the *O.T.* and called Marcion a heretic. There were many on the Catholic side, however, whose understanding of the O.T. left much to be desired. Read the *Epistle of Barnabas,* for instance; if the *O.T.* is only to be retained by resort to such allegorizations one may be excused for choosing to err with Marcion! Marcion has indeed had many followers, and not least today, who advocate repudiation of the *O.T.* or its degradation to the rank of Apocrypha, or a selective use of it, as in Shorter Bibles, Bibles for children, *etc.* The Christian attitude to it was not settled once and for all in the 2nd century when the Roman Church expelled Marcion from its membership and anathematized his doctrines. Consider this judgment of Harnack's, for example, in his great book on Marcion: "The rejection of the *O.T.* in the second century was a mistake which the Great Church rightly refused to make. The retention of it in the sixteenth century was a fate (*Schicksal*) which the Refor-

mation could not yet avoid. But for Protestantism since the nineteenth century to continue to treasure it as a canonical document is the result of a lameness which affects religion and the church". Or consider this pronouncement of our own Dr. Garvie in an article entitled *The Value of the Old Testament for the Christian Church:* "The *O.T.* has been in the history of the Christian Church not only a valuable possession but also a formidable danger. Christian theology and ethics have been brought to a lower level by our indiscriminate blending of the old and the new covenant" (*Expository Times,* May, 1937). To such a critical attitude as this the vindication of the authority of the *O.T.* can be no more than the determining of what precautions need to be taken so that the blending of the two covenants—if they continue to be blended at all, and if "blend" is the apposite word in this connection—may cease to be indiscriminate. If the criterion of discrimination to be adopted is an æsthetic one we shall be left with a selection of *O.T.* passages "designed to be read as literature". If a more ethical criterion is preferred we shall be bidden to concentrate on the moral earnestness of the prophets. There are several possibilities of selection here, one or other of which is doubtless followed by the majority of those who try to read the *O.T.* intelligently. The purpose of this article is to urge that such reading of the *O.T.* does not take seriously its claim to be the Word of God. In fact it implicitly repudiates its authority, as that authority has been recognized by the main stream of Christian orthodoxy. Are we in the light of recent scholarship left no option but to accept this repudiation?

Does modern criticism of the *O.T.* count for nothing as we reflect on this issue? Has Comparative Study of Religions nothing to contribute? Or has the Higher Criticism perchance helped to justify that attitude to the *O.T.* which had its most notable ancient advocate in Marcion and which finds exponents today, among them Harnack as just quoted? Some of the standard books on the *O.T.* are open to the charge of falling short of that goal of *O.T.* study, the commendation of it to the reader as the Word of God and not simply as unique ancient literature. In reaction against the older dogmatic interpretation the books of the *O.T.* were submitted to the same literary and historical criticism as any other ancient writing. This was justifiable and necessary. But if the claim of the *O.T.* to be not merely history, but the revelation of God in history was to be upheld something more was necessary, and the task of the Christian exegete was not finished. It was not enough to have histories of Israel or even histories of the religion of Israel. What was needed was the theology of the *O.T.*, a statement of the contribution of the *O.T.* to the theology of the Bible as a whole.

It is more than a question of the origins of the various docu-

ments, or of historical accuracy, or of the suitability for public worship of certain parts of the *O.T.* It is a question of whether the *O.T.* is by any real differentia to be distinguished from other ancient writings, those of Greece and Rome for example, which are also very useful for describing the antecedents and environment of early Christianity. Has the *O.T.* a quality of revelation which places it in a category apart from other ancient literature, and makes it comparable in quality and authority with the *N.T.*? Or would it be more consistent for the Church to give the *O.T.* a place with the *Apocrypha* as books "gut und nützlich zu lesen", and to cease regarding it as of canonical authority and as on a par with the New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? If the authoritative scriptures of the Church should be that collection of books which reveals what Christianity essentially is (this is what Marcion strove to teach the men of his generation) then, it might be argued, the *O.T.* has no right to be part of the Bible.

We ask then whether the *O.T.* is more than a piece of ancient literature (*The Literature of the Ancient Hebrews* is the title given to the *O.T.* in the *Everyman* edition), or a collection of historical documents which illustrate the life and ideas of the nation into which Christianity was born. This would imply no more than that the historian and theologian cannot neglect to study the *O.T.* It would not imply that the ordinary Christian needed to read it or that it had any special claim on his reverence. It is therefore unsatisfactory that some modern theologies of the *O.T.* based on the historical method seem to make no higher claim for the *O.T.* than this. They tend to be histories of *O.T.* Religion rather than the theology of the *O.T.*, the *O.T.* basis of Biblical theology. Stade's famous work, for example (*Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1905), is disappointing here, as may be judged from the following quotation: "Jesus' preaching everywhere links on to the Jewish religious faith and moral ideals of his time, and his appearance claims to be the fulfilment of Jewish history. His preaching deepened the religious faith and moral ideals of Judaism, and transformed them, in part almost to their opposite, thereby filling religious and ethical conceptions with new and higher content; but He did not create a new realm of religious and ethical thought (*Begriffswelt*)" (*op. cit.* p. 1). This in spite of the fact that Stade deliberately chose as the title of this book *Biblical Theology of the O.T.* in preference to *O.T.* history of religion (*Religionsgeschichte*) and even sacred history (*Heilsgeschichte*) (*cf.* p. 13f). This is the spearhead of recent criticism of many standard works on the *O.T.* One feels about the otherwise excellent Max Loehr: *A History of Religion in the O.T.* that it is similarly disappointing. But Eichrodt's *Theology of the O.T.* is very much more satisfactory, and so, among older scholars, Schultz: "No one can expound *N.T.*

theology without a thorough knowledge of *O.T.* theology. But it is no less true that one who does not thoroughly understand *N.T.* theology cannot have anything but a one-sided view of *O.T.* theology" (Schultz: *O.T. Theology,* E.T.i, p. 59). Among the many merits of Eichrodt's book is the way in which it expounds the meaning of the *O.T.* consistently with reference to the *N.T.* On this subject some careful words of Peake are worth pondering (*The Bible: Its origin, significance and abiding worth,* p. 376f.): "Apart from it (the *O.T.*) we could not understand Jesus Himself, what new thing He brought, the redemption He achieved, the final word He uttered, the supreme figure in the history of religion He was. He is in truth the lonely summit dominating in unapproachable majesty the whole field of history. Yet He does not rise sheer and precipitous from its dead level. . . . We may not detach Him either from the process which led up to Him or the movements which issue from Him. All are needed that He may be placed in His proper context and truly apprehended in all the depth and fulness of His meaning for history".

Fundamentalists are unmoved. For them the question of the right of the *O.T.* to a place side by side with the *N.T.* does not arise. The *O.T.* as a whole and word by word is the Word of God. *Q.E.D. Causa finita est.* But many who disclaim such literalism and profess to believe in the critical approach made possible by the last 100 years of Biblical research are loudly proclaiming their horror of Marcionitism and their avowal of the *O.T.* as the veritable Word from on high. This implies that the problem of the *O.T.* has again become a vital one and that these readers of it would reiterate their belief in its authority against modern Marcionites who repudiate it. And if we ask who are these modern Marcionites we shall find that they are not heretics and atheists outside Christianity, but influential voices within. (Including Harnack, of course. The writer will never forget an evening spent with old Professor Karl Budde at Marburg, and the anguish on his face as he spoke of the opinions expressed in Harnack's book on Marcion.)

But apart from Harnack—he was not an *O.T.* scholar after all —if we take account of the *O.T.* specialists themselves, must we not, it is alleged, charge them with not having completed their task? Certainly they have forged marvellous new weapons, but instead of using them they have been content to admire and polish and sharpen them, like some farmer who acquires the latest Fordson tractor and shows it admiringly enough to all his visitors, but continues to plough with horses—or does not plough at all! The complaint, for long implicit but now increasingly vocal, is that our professional students of the *O.T.* have dallied too long over literary and historical criticism and have not advanced into the theological

province. They have dealt with the questions of the date and authorship of the various books, but have not taught us to find God more easily as we read them; the Divine author has become more remote as the human authors have been made to stand more clearly before us. In short, critical scholarship has on the whole failed, because it has not enabled the *O.T.* to be read and understood as the Word of the living God.

Such is the charge, too serious to be ignored but too sweeping to be true, except in the case of individuals whose experience of commentaries or critical studies has proved to them at least unhelpful. It has been made most recently and at length by Father A. G. Hebert in his book *The Throne of David.* An extended quotation will make his thesis clear: "The *O.T.* is not being fully and wholeheartedly accepted as inspired and as part of the Holy Bible; it is being looked at from the outside from the detached attitude of a would-be impartial scholarship, not from inside as it is regarded by those who live by its life and share the secret of its faith and hope. Where the *O.T.* believes passionately in the mighty acts of God in delivering Israel out of Egypt and choosing Israel to be His people, the new apologetic . . . prefers to trace the course of the development by which Israel advanced from the primitive savagery which marks the early period to the noble monotheism of the great prophets, and to the vision which came to some of them of a broad universalism, a religion for all mankind, in place of the narrow particularism of a religion restricted to a chosen people. In other words, there is a deep theological difference between this new apologetic and the faith of the Bible itself which it seeks to interpret". Too much is made here and throughout the book of the so-called outside point of view of critical scholarship and the inward point of view of the believing Christian. We should aim at synthesis here rather than sharpen the distinction. Nevertheless the warning is significant and timely.

The same charge against some trends of Biblical scholarship, that they tend to stop short of their main task, is made by Karl Barth. See his magnum opus *Kirchliche Dogmatik* I. ii. p. 86f. Reinhold Niebuhr also supports it (*The Nature and Destiny of Man,* i. 146). It is implied that "liberal" scholars tend to develop a blindness to the true stature of the Bible, and slip into treating it as a record of man's thoughts and actions in the religious sphere, rather than of God's confrontation of man, God's acts on the plane of history which are a call and a challenge to man; of God who is not only creator of man's environment but also the judge who shames man's conscience. If the interpreter obscures the fact that the Bible is first and foremost the book which for all generations presents to its reader this creating, speaking, judging God, he is open to this charge.

Rowley's sane and useful book, *The Relevance of the Bible,* is evidence of the awakened interest in Biblical theology as contrasted with Biblical history or archæology or literary criticism, and of the increasingly felt need to make use of the assured results of these other Biblical studies in a new synthesis which will bring out the essential religious meaning of the Bible and present it with a new compulsion as the living Word to this generation. Few perhaps would in these days exalt the old claim of theology to be recognized as queen of the sciences, but theology does now appear to be taking her place as queen of Biblical studies. As Rowley says, the new attitude to the Bible, so far from rejecting earlier study, seeks to conserve it; but more than that, it transcends it. Rowley's argument in this book is in some respects a corroboration of Hebert's, but he manages to explain and indeed justify the new emphasis on theology without disparaging earlier critical study (of which he has more detailed knowledge than Hebert); and thus he does not lay himself open to the charge of merely following the prevailing theological fashion. The following judgment on critical study strikes the right balance: "It has given us a historical understanding of the Bible to be a basis for the spiritual understanding, not a substitute for it" (*op. cit.* p. 99).

Another recent book which calls for mention here is *The O.T. in the Christian Church,* by H. F. D. Sparks. Here, as in Rowley's book, we find a less extreme position taken than in Hebert's *Throne of David,* and judgment is more balanced. There is no suggestion, as occasionally in Hebert, that leading O.T. scholars have not been sufficiently concerned for Christian truth and piety; we come across no paragraph which makes us pause and scribble in the margin: What about Skinner and Adam Smith? What about Peake? What about Wheeler Robinson[1]? These two books of Sparks and Rowley, small as they are, are so concise and relevant and so well directed to real issues that it is not too much to say that they lay down the lines along which the vindication of the use of the *O.T.* as Christian Scripture must continue to be argued; against the Marcionite on the one hand who has no use for the *O.T.* except as one of the books of the ancient East or at most in some sort of revised *Apocrypha,* or new select list of books "good and useful to read" for Christians, though in no sense canonical; and on the other hand against the obscurantist who indignantly protests against any challenging of the *O.T.'s* authority and takes refuge behind a smoke screen of talk about the whole Bible "from cover to cover" being the Word of God. "Neither shall we speak glibly, as the fashion of some is, about putting ourselves under the dis-

1 No one who reads, say Adam Smith or Buchanan Gray on Isaiah 6, for example, could assert that these critical scholars have no concern for the deep things of religion, or that the *O.T.* is just an ancient book and not for us the Word of God.

cipline of the Word of God without giving at the same time any very clear reason, beyond assertion, why the *O.T.* should be still styled God's Word at all, or wherein it differs from any other religious literature" (Sparks, *op. cit.*, p. 100). In his last chapter, entitled *The Value of the O.T. Today,* Sparks sets out very fairly arguments made on either side and gives his own vote for retention of the whole *O.T.* without limit or expurgation.

Among recent books mention must also be made of Godfrey Phillips's *Old Testament in the World Church.* This is valuable both for the evidence adduced from Christians of the younger churches about the difficulties raised by the *O.T.*—some of it quite unsophisticated, for example, the Chinese pastor (p. 23) who remarked that "reading the *O.T.* is like eating a large crab; it turns out to be mostly shell, with very little meat in it"—and also for the author's sound advocacy of the authority of the *O.T.* There are some excellent pages, for instance (39-51), on the subject of particular revelation through one people, the Jews, which creates an obvious difficulty for people of races which have long traditions and highly developed civilizations, as in India and China. The author is in favour of the neglected typological use of the *O.T.* (p. 87-91), *i.e.*, as providing types and shadows of what was to come. There is *N.T.* precedent for this, of course. And apart from the hymn of St. John of Damascus which Phillips quotes as an example of this usage of the *O.T.* thought and language (Israel's deliverance from Egypt typifying redemption generally) there is all the wealth of it in the hymns of Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley. This does not mean opening the door to the abuses of allegory. It is "to see God's hand in the whole course of history of which Jesus is the centre, and to perceive His work more clearly by allowing its earlier and later stages to illuminate each other. Linguistic and historical disciplines make their exacting demand that we discover what words meant when the Hebrew writer first set them down. But a wider use of the same disciplines over the range of Jewish-Christian history may show the meaning of those same words deepening through the experience of the centuries, and finally, when Christ appears, uttering truth about Him which is eternal, part of God's message to men of faith in every age" (p. 89).

The Church needs the *O.T.* if it is to know Christ and preach Christ as He truly is, set in relief against the appropriate background of Law and Prophecy, incarnate by divine economy in the fulness of time. It is perhaps too much to say with Brunner (see below) that Christ and His teaching and work have no meaning except in the context of the *O.T.;* but it is the plain truth that Christ is not properly intelligible without the *O.T.* By this is meant not simply that Christian scholars need to study the *O.T.* in order to understand the origins of Christianity and the meaning

of the Gospel in the minds of its first hearers. It means that anyone who would learn of Christ must read not only Gospels and Epistles, but the *O.T.* as well. Even the "simple believer" needs to meditate on the words of prophets and historians of the Old Covenant in order to perceive the richness of the words of Him who inaugurated the New Covenant. As Brunner puts it (*Die Unentbehrlichkeit des alten Testaments für die missionierende Kirche*, p. 7): "Jesus grew not only on Palestinian soil, but on Old Testament soil. From the Old Testament He learnt what God's will and God's nature are. . . . Without the Old Testament there is no Jesus Christ".

But the relation between the *O.T.* and the *N.T.* is not adequately described as one of natural development, the evolution of the perfect out of the imperfect. If that were all, then the imperfect could be discarded and forgotten, as Marcion and those who think with him have always said. The relation is rather that of Promise and Fulfilment which have never become independent of one another. Though the fulfilment has taken place it still needs the promise to make it intelligible, and only has meaning in the context of the promise and by reference to it. Brunner uses the analogy of a sentence to illustrate this. *O.T.* and *N.T.* are related as beginning and end of a sentence; each needs the other, and the whole sentence comes into being and is intelligible only when the two parts or clauses are held together. "Only that Christ who is promised in the *O.T.* is really Christ. The being promised belongs essentially to His being Christ" (*op. cit.* p. 10). Brunner's discussion of this is so relevant that it must be quoted further: "The Incarnation of the Word cannot be understood without the word of the Forerunner, neither can the breaking in of the Kingdom of God be understood without the Israelite theocracy, nor the message about the Cross without the *O.T.* priestly sacrificial system. Jesus is what these things mean (*Jesus ist, was jene meinen*), and what He is can be understood only in the light of what they mean (*nur als der, der das ist, was jene meinen*)" (*op. cit.* p. 19).

The *O.T.* is not a religious textbook; nor a book of theology, even if we call it *un*systematic theology. It is to be regarded as the record of the progressive apprehension of God's self-revelation, and at the same time the bearer of that revelation to all who read and wait upon God in faith. The revelation was given gradually, on various occasions and through varied media, "by divers portions and in divers manners" as the author of *Hebrews* puts it. It was of course intended not for the original recipients only, but for men of faith in later ages. To this end God provided that there should be a record (our theory of inspiration is presupposed here), and this record, which in one sense is, and in another sense is not, the revelation, is our Bible of two testaments.

We ought to be cautious in speaking of progressive revelation. The progress lay in men's response to revelation, and nowhere is that more significant for mankind as a whole than in ancient Israel. We may venture to paraphrase the famous words of *Hebrews* 1[1] as "'progressively'' because when Israel's religious documents are viewed as a whole they certainly do exhibit progress in the knowledge of God. But taken in themselves the words mean strictly the varied response of man to God, and do not necessarily imply progress from more to more without any regress or decline.

This record of revelation which constitutes the *O.T.* refers by its very nature to times and places. The revelation is in and through history; not in the bare events, but in the events plus their inspired interpretation. The same God who reveals Himself and causes historical patterns to unfold as they actually do is active also in inspiring certain men to discern His working and declare it to their contemporaries. Ancient Greece as well as ancient Israel had a momentous history; the parallels between Greece's deliverance from Persia and Israel's deliverance from Egypt or Babylon might be worth drawing out; but what is distinctive of Israel is the way in which historic crises were interpreted by a unique succession of men who discerned in time the action of a Power beyond time.

The Word or revelation of God then is conveyed through concrete situations of ancient history. It is always as it were in solution, never undiluted, neat, unmediated. We must not expect it otherwise; for God is God and we are men upon the earth. We must not be impatient of the details of Hebrew history in which we are involved if we wish to draw near to the living God under the guidance of Amos or Jeremiah; and we must not think Sennacherib's army a nuisance if we would share the faith which enabled Isaiah to be serene when they surrounded Jerusalem. We cannot make a collection of prophetic utterances and say: This is the revelation contained in the *O.T.* That would be the mistake of treating the *O.T.* as a mere source book, like the diaries of anthropologists residing among primitive peoples. The *O.T.* has a right to be differently treated. Its objective element, *i.e.*, the actual words, should be taken in closest connection with the subjective element, *i.e.*, the circumstances of the prophet or historian, at the court of David or in exile in Babylon, for example. If isolated and studied *in abstracto* a passage is almost bound to be misunderstood. It becomes as it were dead; "we murder to dissect''. This was the fault of so much of the older exegesis, particularly if it turned to allegorization. A chapter or verse needs to be seen living, *i.e.*, in reference to the actual situation in which it was originally uttered or written. In the case of Isaiah and Jeremiah, for example, their words concerning the destiny of Jerusalem taken out of context and compared are contradictory; but the contradiction lies

only in the difference of circumstances in which these two prophets lived, not in their testimony to the working of God. They believe in the same living active God, and proclaim His judgment and providence. The *O.T.'s* claim for itself is that though it is ancient history, *etc.*, just as the language in which it is written is ancient Hebrew and not English or any modern *lingua franca,* it is so only as the medium of the Word of God veritably given to men of ancient days, and potent for re-application to every subsequent day. Because of this the function of a commentary is to explain historical and geographical references, grammar and syntax, *etc.*, so that the application to the circumstances of the reader follows naturally and compellingly, and he finds himself "standing under the Word of God" which has become a living word for him. Calvin's commentaries are still a model of this, in spite of the comparative paucity of linguistic and historical knowledge available to him. The method is absolutely right, and the application is generally both sober and forceful. Luther's *dictum* about the Incarnation: "Poor and wretched the swaddling-bands are, but precious is the treasure that lies in them" is capable of application to the *O.T.* as well.

The ultimate answer to this whole question of the *O.T.* must be that the *O.T.* is the Word of God because the Gospel is contained in it; no less and no other than the Christian Gospel which has its final authentication in the *N.T.* through Him who inaugurated the new covenant. The new covenant was inaugurated by Christ, and it is right to emphasize its newness; but all the time it must be remembered that the covenant idea cannot be understood apart from the *O.T.* It is in fact the main thread of the *O.T.* It proclaims to us a God who, though constantly defied and frustrated by man (Israel) and thus legally entitled to break off relations with man, nevertheless does not do so but is constantly concerned to re-make the broken covenant, to provide a remnant who will be faithful though the majority have proved faithless, to keep alive a godly nucleus, as a means to the ultimate salvation of the whole people. This covenant idea runs through the whole *O.T.* and is not confined to those books which actually use the word "covenant". This is not simply one way of writing history, a distinctively Jewish philosophy of history; it is primarily testimony to the nature of God and His way of dealing with refractory mankind; primarily, that is, gospel. It is witness to the mighty acts of God for our redemption; assurance that God is active, livingly present, yearning over sinful man, ever providing new hope, new ways out of national chaos and personal chaos and new ways forward to the City of God. That there is much else in the *O.T.*, and some of it dubious history and sub-Christian morality, need cause no embarrassment. For the *O.T.* makes no claim to the accuracy and modernity of an encyclopædia. But it contains that proclamation of the grace of

God which in the light of Christ we must not hesitate to call Gospel. If this is sometimes obscured or overlaid with things of meaner value we should not grumble, but remember Luther's saying, "Precious is the treasure that lies in them".

To point to this treasure, and to prevent it being lost sight of through the meaner swaddling bands in which it is laid, is the function of critical study. Some are deterred by the very meanness of those swaddling bands; some apparently are too much engrossed in them. The fundamentalist reading of the *O.T.* implies that these protective clothes are just as important as the Gospel babe who is wrapped in them. That is an unnecessary trembling for the ark of God, and it hinders rather than helps. A critical distinction must be made between the central truth and its inadequate expression; or, to quote Forsyth's way of putting it, between the whole of the Bible (*i.e.*, the unified message running through the whole) and the Bible as a whole (*i.e.*, the sum total of chapters and verses). What we need from our teachers and guides is to be led through the details to this central truth. If in the case of the *O.T.* this truth does not appear to be Gospel, then Marcion will seem right and the argument of this article wrong, to say nothing of the faith of Christian readers since the Ethiopian eunuch who was led to Christ through his reading of the *O.T.* and was baptized by Philip the evangelist. But if it can be recognized as Gospel, the authority of the *O.T.* needs no further argument, for the *O.T.* will be known as a Gospel book and as such the bearer of the Word of God to all generations.

FROM DR. ALBERT PEEL

The Editor, CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY

SIR,—I should be grateful if you would allow me to say a word of thanks to all those who have been good enough to write me on my retirement from the editorial chair you now occupy—to County Unions and churches which have passed resolutions, to editors of other journals, and to individual readers, not least those who have read every issue since the beginning. I am particularly grateful for messages from readers outside our own denomination. They have vied with Congregationalists in saying things I am proud to remember: I only wish I could think I deserved a tithe of them.

This appreciation will, I trust, be stimulus and encouragement to you, sir, in the responsible task you and your colleagues have undertaken.

Yours sincerely,

ALBERT PEEL.

DR. T. W. MANSON'S ATTACK ON LIBERALISM

By Dr. C. J. Cadoux

The lecture on "The Failure of Liberalism to interpret the Bible as the Word of God", which Dr. T. W. Manson contributed to the recently-published volume entitled *The Interpretation of the Bible*, has had a very good press. *The Times Literary Supplement* said that in it the author "is seen at his best", and has since quoted it approvingly, while *The Expository Times* described it enthusiastically as likely to "become a classic", and added: "certainly every working minister would find it a fortification of his faith".

By Liberalism Dr. Manson appears to mean chiefly the views expressed by Harnack in *What is Christianity?* and by Bousset in *What is Religion?*, and the main objects of his attack are what he regards as the inevitable implicates of these views. I do not wish to take up the cudgels on behalf of these two scholars in particular. I would observe only that Harnack at least certainly believed in a personal God who was in touch with man, that every position can be overdriven and exaggerated by those who criticize it, and that some Liberals have admittedly gone to extremes (a fault not unknown in traditionalist circles also). I regret alike both the exaggeration and the extremes: but what I am here concerned to do is to show that the particular complaints which Dr. Manson expresses do not constitute any case against Liberalism in general.

It is at least gratifying to note that, although he censures Liberalism, he advocates no short cut to truth by way of a revival of traditional dogmas. " . . . I should say", he writes, "that to take refuge in the dogmatic formulæ of the past, however venerable, is simply to give up the theological task" (p. 105). Furthermore, he explicitly and emphatically asserts the soundness of the critical method. All historical and literary questions are to be frankly faced with the aid of the whole apparatus of critical scholarship. But he does not, I think, allow for the fact that this use of criticism presupposes, as a condition of its reaching even the most modest conclusions, a confident acceptance of all those canons of probability and improbability which have hitherto vindicated themselves to us in our investigation of human affairs. The validity of these canons we all take for granted in our studies, until they point to some critical conclusion with which we personally disagree. Then they take on the form of "Liberal prejudices".

Dr. Manson says that "Liberalism had to fall out with historical Christianity". But fifty or sixty years ago, the very criticism

of which he is himself so distinguished an exponent was thought by most to be a breach with historical Christianity, and is still today thought by many to be so. The reason why most of us do not so regard it is that, unlike our ancestors, we are satisfied that the methods and main conclusions of criticism are true, and cannot therefore be in conflict with the real Gospel. Whatever is true must *ipso facto* be in harmony with the essence of Christianity. To urge—as Dr. Manson seems to do on p. 104 of the book containing his lecture—that the scientist and the theologian ought each to pursue his own line independently of the other, is surely to court failure. Theologians cannot ignore other known truth: they must try to synthetize their theology with it—otherwise they are making the Gospel harder for simple men to accept, and so putting a σκάνδαλον in the way of Christ's little ones.

Science has proved that, over a very large area of existence, God has ordained that the regularities we usually know as "Natural Law" shall prevail. Dr. Manson, however, shrinks from any frank recognition of this fact. Throughout his lecture there runs a protest to the effect that this belief in Natural Law was a dogmatic presupposition overhastily assumed by Liberalism, that it was understood to rule out not only miracles, but all special revelations by God to man, that it erected an impassable and soundproof sheet of plate-glass between man and God, and in short that it made any real revelation and in the end any real religion impossible.

On this I would offer the following observations.

(1) No sane man today, whatever his theological views, dreams for a moment of doubting in his daily life the truth of this scientific view of Natural Law.

(2) No historical criticism, and *a fortiori* no biblical criticism (not even so simple an operation as demonstrating the priority of Mark), is possible without the acceptance of this view: and Dr. Manson, as a practised critic, is just as dependent on it as any Liberal scholar has ever been.

(3) The acceptance of this view necessitates a different version of happenings in the natural world from the version given in Bible-times, when men knew nothing of Natural Law and regarded all happenings in nature as the result of *ad hoc* volitions of God. The general Liberal rejection of Nature-miracles (as traditionally understood) is therefore not a prejudice but an implicate of presuppositions forced upon us by the post-biblical enlargement of our knowledge of God's ways.

(4) It is, however, a mistake to suppose that this acceptance of Natural Law bars God out of His universe or reduces Him to a *roi fainéant*. We feel no difficulty in harmonizing such acceptance, even when it demands room for psychology and for glands, with

our personal freedom and with personal intercourse, influence, and responsibility. Why therefore need we suppose that Natural Law rules out personal communication between God and ourselves, such as prayer and special revelation presuppose? Individual Liberals may have existed who drew that inference: but there was no necessity for it, and it was certainly not drawn by Liberals generally. The only stipulation one must make is that any alleged revelation God may grant to men will, like our conversation with one another, almost certainly make use of and conform to the psychological and other laws of our being, which experience increasingly makes known to us.

These considerations surely suffice to demonstrate the unfairness of disparaging Liberalism on the ground that it involves too much "picking and choosing among the Biblical material". Dr. Manson condemns excessive and "arbitrary" picking and choosing, such as banishes "all the characteristic flavour of the Biblical teaching". But these are very vague words, and they leave completely unanswered the question as to how we are to distinguish between the right kind of picking and choosing and the wrong. For *some* picking and choosing is incumbent upon us all. The Bible "teaches", for instance, that God hated Esau, that He hardened Pharaoh's heart, that He enjoined the wholesale massacre of civilian populations, that He struck Uzzah dead for his well-meant effort to save the ark from falling, that He "moved David" to number the people and then punished the people for it, and that He said He would pay Nebuchadrezzar and his army with the spoil and captive population of Egypt for their trouble in taking Tyre (*Ezek.* $29^{17\text{-}20}$). I imagine that Dr. Manson, the writer of the "Notes of Recent Exposition" in *The Expository Times,* and indeed most modern Christians, will agree that these statements about God are erroneous. Yet they are just as "biblical" as are *Psalm* 23, *Romans* 5^{8}, and *John* 3^{16}, and contribute just as much to "the characteristic flavour of the Biblical teaching". What then becomes of the blame meted out to Liberalism for "picking and choosing among the Biblical material" to whatever extent the material may require?

Dr. Manson insists emphatically on the distinction between God's spoken words and special revelations on the one hand, and man's deepest convictions on the other. "Every prophet", he says, "knew the difference between 'Thus saith the Lord' and 'I am absolutely convinced' ". But did he? Whenever his convictions relevant to an urgent situation were strong, he said, "Thus saith the Lord": and when they were also sound, he was right in so introducing them—for "the spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord", and Duty is the "stern daughter of the voice of God". (Incidentally, it is worth observing that, when Paul pronounced the most

tremendous affirmation in the New Testament—*Romans* 8^{38-39}—he introduced it by saying, not "Thus saith the Lord", but "For I am persuaded", in other words "I am absolutely convinced"). But sometimes these convictions, being humanly mediated, were erroneous. What then? Could the prophet be relied on in such a situation to refrain from saying "Thus saith the Lord"? Clearly not. If it be urged that, while man's conviction may be mistaken, God's word to the prophet cannot be, I answer Yes: but the prophet was sometimes mistaken in what he believed God to have said. How else do you account for the shocking words spoken by Ezekiel in the Lord's name to Nebuchadrezzar? Dr. Manson wants us to have "courage to believe that God has spoken". By all means: but how are we to know when He *has* spoken? It would clearly be arbitrary to "believe that God has spoken" whenever it says so in the Bible. For in that case we should have no right to distinguish between *Ezek.* 29^{17-20} and *Romans* 8^{38-39}. Such distinctions we must all draw: and whether consciously or not we draw them on the same authority that bids us hear a clearer word of God in the Bible as a whole than in any other book. This authority is what Calvin called the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*. The sharp distinction therefore which Dr. Manson would draw between revelation and true conviction I cannot but regard as illusory, and I believe the Liberals were perfectly right in not admitting it. One needs some better ground for receiving a statement as a Divine revelation than the speaker's assertion that it is one, or even than its occurrence in canonical Scripture. What else can that better ground be than the voice of the Holy Spirit of God speaking within the intelligence and conscience of man?

Underlying Dr. Manson's argument, as well as a great deal of present-day theological argument, there seems to be a desire to cut out the human and subjective conditions of religious belief, and a tacit assumption that, unless you can cut these right out, you are virtually banishing God from His universe. The mistake arises, I believe, from a failure to make allowance for the thought-idiom of ancient times and for such enlargement of vision as nearly two millennia of Christian experience and thought have brought to us. The same misunderstanding appears again in Dr. Manson's objection to people speaking about men "bringing in", or "building", the Kingdom of God. Admittedly these phrases are not biblical: but neither is the notion that the coming of the Kingdom is independent of human effort. Of course, *in a sense*, the Kingship of God exists independently of man's obedience, inasmuch as God's right to man's obedience exists whether man obeys or not. But if the "coming" of the Kingdom were, as modern scholars are wont to represent it, a climax exclusively depending on God's sovereign will, what is the sense of bidding men pray for it, and still more

bidding them "seek" it? Some allowance must be made here for the nature of the biblical thought-idiom. When the Psalmist said, "Except the Lord build the house . . . ", did he mean that a human architect was not to draw the plans, and Hebrew craftsmen not to put the structure together? When the Hebrew general reported that Yahweh had given him the victory, did he mean that he and his men had just had to sit and twiddle their thumbs, since the battle was not theirs but God's? By overlooking this idiom of biblical thought, some modern scholars have too hastily concluded that the necessity of human co-operation is not recognized either in the Bible generally or in the Gospels in particular. On the other hand, a due recognition of the important place filled by the human response to God's claim need not involve, as Dr. Manson fears, the exclusion of God; nor has it involved that inference in the case of any leading Liberal writer or teacher known to me.

If I have succeeded in showing that the frank Liberal acceptance of Natural Law does not rule out personal intercourse between God and man, I do not perhaps need to show in detail that Liberalism does not confine itself to messages *about* God as distinct from messages *from* God, that while it may modify, it does not emasculate the Christian's belief in God's Fatherhood, that it does not discard "the infinite value of the individual soul", that it does not reduce duty to a completer knowledge of biology and psychology, and certainly does not lead logically to pure humanism and the totalitarian State. I can only express my surprise that such suggestions and warnings should be considered necessary.

I do not think it has ever been claimed that Liberalism clears up all theological problems, and leaves no difficult questions to be solved. To leave certain great issues unsettled may be a sign of wisdom rather than of error and inadequacy. Dr. Manson has complained elsewhere that Liberalism can offer only an Abelardian theory of the Atonement. But how if that theory be the true one? He adds that it can offer no satisfactory theory of the Incarnation. But how in that respect is it any worse off than traditionalism? Is the traditional Chalcedonian theory of the One "Person" with two "Natures", and its implicate that Christ's humanity is not personal, a satisfactory theory? Again, he reproaches Liberalism with not knowing what to make of the Biblical eschatology. But who, I ask, is in any better case? It is all very well for the author of the "Notes of Recent Exposition" in *The Expository Times* to join cheerfully in this reproach of Liberalism. But does he himself know the answer to the eschatological problem? And does Dr. Manson? If, as seems possible, their solution be Dr. C. H. Dodd's theory of "Realized Eschatology", then I submit that that theory has to force the New Testament evidence just as violently as any Liberal scholar has done, and that, while the theory is not without

its element of truth, it has not won the acceptance of the majority of scholars. If as a whole it be rejected (as in my judgment it must be), we may well find that we have no exegetical option left to us but some theory of "kernel-and-husk". And why not?

In conclusion, let me say that to me—as (I believe) to most Liberals—the dealings and relations of God with us are, because fatherly, in the main personal dealings and relations. The problem is—how to relate this *personal* action of God, which seems to require on His part special revelations and occasional and particular acts of intervention and irruption, to that constant and regular disciplinary beneficence which characterizes the Laws of Nature, when widely and rightly understood. Without the former, "God" seems simply an additional and unnecessary name for "Nature". Without the latter, His actions will seem arbitrary and erratic, as if He were more concerned for some men than for others, and as if even for them He were more concerned at one time than at another. I am, however, disposed to inquire whether, seeing that God is the perfect person, the distinction between particular acts and regular policy, between special revelations and general revelation, can be maintained. The actions of an infinite and perfect person must needs be constant and regular, for we are bound to think of Him as always and equally concerned and active on behalf of all men. On the other hand, they must also be special and occasional, in so far as they are being continually adapted and re-adapted to the changing needs of different individuals and groups. In any case, those who hold that God does truly and personally deal with men, but that He does so in ways conformable to the natural laws (both physical and psychological) which He Himself has devised to govern their life, are entitled to deny firmly the soft impeachment that they are shutting God out of His world.

The picture which Dr. Manson paints of Liberalism, therefore, and still more the inferences he draws from it, seem to me hardly to "show him at his best", or to be likely to "become a classic", because they fail to do justice to the phase of theological thought with which he is dealing. In virtually ignoring—because it is ignored in the Bible—the place which Natural Law must take in any true understanding of God's ways with men, Dr. Manson seems to me to cramp his own style, and—so far from giving every working minister a fortification of his faith—to be likely to leave the working minister stranded in face of some of those searching questions which the human mind is asking, and will continue to ask, concerning the realities of the Christian religion and the relation of the Scriptures to it.

ON CERTAIN ASPECTS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN AND ROBERT WILLIAM DALE, SUGGESTED BY TWO 1945 COMMEMORATIONS

By A. H. Driver, M.B., Ch.B.

"The present is God hiding Himself, the past is God letting Himself be seen".

"God will not make Himself felt in the past except by those who have tried to divine Him in the present".

Rightly to ponder these two discerning remarks of Abbé Henri Bremond is to find ample justification for seizing centenaries as opportunities for attempts at reassessment of personalities in the light of their influence on religious thought and practice, then and now. The centenary of the central landmark in Newman's chequered pilgrimage—his submission to Rome—falls this year, and however far most of us may be from acceptance of the beliefs and loyalties to which he bound himself, few would hesitate to apply to him a sentence of his own: "Great saints, great events, great privileges, like the everlasting mountains, grow as we recede from them". It comes from a sermon on this theme of retrospection to which he was peculiarly sensitive—though this sensitivity was held in careful balance by his insistent awareness of the complementary duty of watchfulness and anticipation. Abbé Bremond—whose study of Newman remains a pearl of price—quotes such characteristic sentences as "God's presence is not discerned at the time when it was upon us, but afterwards, when we look back upon what is gone and over" and finds in them something "of the invincible opposition which the religious ideas of Newman encounter in a genuine Protestant". We may refuse wholly to accept this impeachment while admitting that we lose much by our failure to bring into the framework of public worship remembrance of saints distinctively Catholic. The *anima Christiana* refuses to be bound by any one of the tenses and we must demur to any idea that the discerning of "Christ Manifested in Remembrance" is the prerogative of the *anima catholica* if the adjective be interpreted in any narrow sense. God forbid that our calendar of saints should begin at the Reformation, or exclude those outside our own enclosure, or that we should cease eagerly to trace the hand of God moving through the histories of persons, communities and nations.

The influence of Newman on Anglican and Roman religious life during the last century and beyond was so dominant—and, in retrospect, so salutary—that the crisis in his development of 1845 will

certainly be reviewed this year by Anglican and Roman pens, but the career of Newman is of as much interest to Free Churchmen over many of whom he exerts a fatal and paradoxical attraction. This lies beyond the hypnotism which hovers over his peerless English, and beyond the respect due to a controversialist who was as dreaded, if no doubt as salutary, a thorn in the flesh to the Evangelicals as was Matthew Arnold to a later Dissent. It may be found in certain strains in his teaching, recurring inevitably, and striking chords more dominant, more haunting, than certain other notes which to our ears mar the melody by evoking marks of interrogation. These elements are so instinct with the Christian spirit that their appeal is immediate and irresistible to ears awake and attuned. Neither can we forget the fact—one which coloured much of his expression—that his spiritual birth took place within our traditions. His first conversion was within the atmosphere of that undiluted Calvinism in which many of our Congregational churches were enveloped for at least the first hundred years of their separate existences, and with which they are, in varying and somewhat uncertain degree, still tempered. It no doubt differed, in intellectual and emotional content, from any other evangelical conversion before or since, but the fact remains that Newman's first, vivid, and ineffaceable experience of the hand of God—the alone meeting with the Alone—was surrounded by influences of men within our camp. The influences of Thomas Scott, for example: Scott, portrayed to us in Sir James Stephens's essays as a plodding, devoted, literalistic divine and commentator, does not impress us as possessing much higher distinction than that of many others of his school in his day, but yet of him Newman says "to him I almost owe my soul". And there is, piously preserved within a glass case in the Birmingham Oratory, a little book given to Newman by his well-beloved tutor, the Rev. Walter Mayer, of Pembroke, and treasured throughout the years. It is Beveridge: "Private Thoughts", and its history, incidentally, is one illustration, among many, of the almost sacramental value Newman attached to material things . . . if a book is a material thing! Romaine and Isaac Watts were other Calvinists through whom the Spirit touched the soul of Newman, though soon of course he detected in them the dross of heresy.

There has been no warmer or more sympathetic Protestant appreciation of Newman than that of Dr. Alexander Whyte, made nearly forty years ago, but so wholehearted was the doctor's acceptance of the doctrine of justification by faith, so deep his reverence for those to whom it was so sacrosanct as to be unassailable, that he found it difficult to forgive Newman for his barbed assaults on contemporary interpretations of it. He finds Newman pathetic, not so much in having joined the Church of Rome but in his having parted from the Evangelical faith, to which farewell he ascribes the lack

of unfettered gladness in his outlook. One wonders if, in this reluctant criticism, he made quite sufficient allowance for the lop-sided defects of the Calvinism from which Newman revolted. We wonder at his bowing to the inflexible dogmas of Roman Catholicism, but were they not in some respects less rigorous than the creed of his adolescence? He travelled his own path, but it is possible to overlook how far we too have travelled. If *we* had to choose between the uncompromising rigours of the system he renounced—with its insistence upon the total depravity of man (a dogma Rome has solemnly condemned), its unimaginative biblical literalism, and its stern banishing of every form of artistic expression from worship—and a tempered and liberal catholicism, is there any doubt which most of us would choose? We, too, should be with him in his distaste for the morbid introspection, and demands for emotional experiences as evidence of the work of saving grace which characterized the period, with its literature full of stories of the death-bed scenes of preternaturally pious children or of impenitent sinners. And does not modern Protestant thinking tend to look upon the act of faith as rather a consistent and continuing attitude, an idea which very closely approaches that insisted upon throughout the Parochial Sermons?

Surely M. Bremond is right in his suggestion that the argument that Newman's was a religion of fear could equally well be applied to the Puritans, and right also in his refusing so to apply it, for he knew perfectly well how inevitably cheerfulness kept breaking through the most austere Puritan exterior. The rigour of his creed was constantly being denied by the fact of humanity and kindliness in family and social relationships and by a bubbling fervour of devotion in the life of religion. How astonishing it is, and how illuminating, to find in the Abbé's third volume on the French School his discovery in Thomas Goodwin of the first English advocate of the Devotion of the Sacred Heart!

We may well hesitate before concluding that the prevailingly austere note running through the Parochial sermons is entirely misconceived. One does not mean the many frankly Calvinistic passages on the narrowness of the way, the fewness of the elect, and the reality of eternal punishment, but rather his constant insistence that a state of grace is dependent on ever renewed acts of contrition, the seeking of renewals of grace, and an attitude of watchfulness. Modern assurance and convention, which so easily exclude reverence, may boggle over characteristic words of the Newman vocabulary—awe . . . trembling . . . fear . . . and stumble, as over a hard saying, at such a sentence as

> His love does not necessarily exclude his anger, nor His favour His severity, nor His grace His judgments,

but modern assurance may well be an imperfect manifestation of the Christian temper. Even so, ever and anon, after pages in which

the note of awe and trembling seems too insistent for human frailty to sustain, or the Newmanian shades of meaning round the word "trust" too subdued, or the call to "watchfulness" seemingly beyond our powers, suddenly a phrase lightens and cheers like a flash of sunlight over a grey and slightly troubled sea: such as, for example (in a sermon on "watchfulness"), "[They want] the tender and sensitive heart which hangs on the thought of Christ and lives in His love". This is the note shedding its beauty in "Gerontius" and its charm in "Callista".

It is not the purpose of this essay to attempt to represent the salient strands of Newman's teaching, nor to re-examine the paradox whereby one of the keenest intellects of the century allowed itself to be subordinated to the claims of the heart and the imagination; but, at the risk of stating that which is familiar to most *Quarterly* readers, there is an abiding value in (1) the intensity of his awareness of the reality of the unseen world—so subtly and irresistibly conveyed that we can almost imagine we hear the voice from St. Mary's insisting that "what we see is as a screen hiding from us God and Christ, and His Saints and Angels", and (2) his insistence on the primacy of conscience. No submission to and acceptance of a sacerdotal system ever dimmed the reality of that encounter between "two, and two only luminously self-evident beings", himself and God. In the last analysis, in the crises of living and in the crisis of dying, no mediation of priest or authority of Pope could for him add to or subtract from the validity of the mystical vision. Newman was an arch-Protestant in the sense that every mystic "protests" and proclaims that which he knows to be certain; and (3) his scorn for an easy-going, conventional religion whose votaries would "venture nothing, risk and sacrifice nothing, abandon nothing, on the faith of Christ's word"—or for a religion compliant to State intervention and dictation. Sooner than this let the comfortable bishops accept "spoiling of their goods and martyrdom" as a token of the apostolic spirit. Newman would not need to look further today than across the water to find apostles after his own heart. "Such", he cries, "was the triumph of Faith. . . . It enjoined the law of love for retaliation; it put pain before enjoyment; it honoured poverty before affluence, the Communion of Saints before the civil power, the next world before this. It made the Christian independent of all men and all things, except of Christ; and provided for a deeper humility, while it abounded in peace and joy".

It is never wholly unprofitable to contemplate the past in the light of the present and with Newman as an excuse one is tempted to proffer a few reflections on mutual relationships. How ancient asperities have become blunted! Centres like Birmingham in the mid-19th century could fill their town halls with prolonged and

noisy debate on the rights and wrongs of the establishment of the hierarchy, our Angell James fulminating on "this foul, dangerous and daring aggression" though be it remembered that we had nonconformists such as George Dawson and Joseph Sturge lifting their voices to claim for others the same liberty they demanded for themselves. (Nowadays one's only regret for the quieting of controversy lies in the fact that it may only be indicative of a reluctance to be moved by *any* religious issue.) It was these demonstrations that gave Newman opportunity for pretty exhibitions of rapier play at the Corn Exchange, Birmingham, and in London, but it is doubtful if he was most at home on the controversial platform, and certainly the aged Newman could strike a note which makes heated polemics look outmoded. It runs through the letter to Henry Allon, the Congregational Editor, quoted below:

> Jan. 28, 1868.
>
> Truth is one, but it has manifold aspects, and though the *British Quarterly* is not with us, as regards our creed, yet it *is* with us in the great controversy of the day, our controversy with the spirit of infidelity, and in a missionary country like this our duty seems to fall under our Lord's rule, "He that is not against us is for us".
>
> Whatever tends to create a unity of heart between men of separate communions lays the ground for advances towards a restoration of that visible unity the absence of which among Christians is so great a triumph and so great an advantage to the enemies of the Cross. Those actual advances and still less that restoration, cannot, alas, be reasonably expected to take place in our day but the ground may be laid, and those who, in laying it, have "done what they could", however small may be their work, have deep cause to thank Almighty God for having been allowed to do it. I rejoice to be accounted such.
>
> I am, dear Sir, very truly yours,
>
> JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Thomas Mozley tells us that Newman studiously avoided the use of the term "Evangelical" in his circle of friends. It rarely appears, too, where we should most expect it, namely, in his *Lectures on Justification*. Was this because he was at heart an evangelical (certainly he never hesitated to acknowledge his debt to that school), and hence disliked the bandying to and fro of a good word as a label in the heat of party controversy? A most significant letter in which it appears in a gracious setting (to Mr. Edwards, a former secretary of the London Evangelical Society), is printed in Ward's *Life* and is worth reproducing (dated February, 1887):

> . . . I will not close our correspondence, without testifying my simple love and adhesion to the Catholic Roman Church,

> not that I think you doubt this; and did I wish to give a reason for this full and absolute devotion, what should, what can I say but that those great and burning truths which I learned when a boy from Evangelical teaching, I have found impressed upon my heart with fresh and ever increasing force by the Holy Roman Church? That Church has added to the simple Evangelicalism of my first teachers, but it has obscured, diluted, enfeebled, nothing of it. On the contrary I have found a power, a resource, a comfort, a consolation in our Lord's Divinity and atonement, in His real presence in communion, in His Divine and Human power, which all good Catholics indeed have, but which Evangelical Christians have but faintly. But I have not strength to say more. . . .

Another commemorative landmark happens this year: it is fifty years since the death of Dr. R. W. Dale, and possibly a heightened sense of the uniqueness of both Dale and Newman may be discovered by way of analogy and contrast. It is true, as Dale himself once said, that "every Christian man walks in a path along which no feet but his own have ever travelled before". A later Christian says the same thing in his own characteristic way:

> "Although the substance and the primary phenomena of religion are eternal, they appear in each soul with an individuality and a freshness pathetically unique. . . . The realities of every religious life remain fresh indeed with the deathless vitality of love and grace". Continuing, von Hugel finds it "the highest intellectual honour of each succeeding period to attempt an ever less inadequate apprehension of the divine in our poor human life".

This is true indeed. Yet no absurdity lies in thus bracketing the two men. The fact that both were great souls is more relevant than accidents of time and place, but both were contemporaries in the same city, Dale entering his full ministry (1851) in the very year that Newman, after a year or two in the obscurity of Alcester Street, Birmingham, was preparing to move to the community life of the Oratory. The aged Cardinal died in 1890, five years before the Doctor. There is no record that they ever actually met, though it is difficult to believe that they did not do so. There is an interesting reference in Dale's life, p. 209 (can anyone supply chapter and verse?):

> Cardinal Newman, lamenting his own isolation from the people among whom he lived, and the failure of others to reach them, referred with thankfulness to the hold that Dale had upon the town, and to the force with which he preached the gospel.

It is further recorded that Dale invited his congregation to pray for the dying Cardinal and we know that Dale prized highly his appreciative letter on his book, *The Atonement*.

Dr. Dale was one who gave to many of his contemporaries the impression of the embodiment of the Church militant—intervening effectively and with zest in the dusty arena of social and political life. To outward seeming how utterly different was the ministry of the other—that of an acknowledged Prince of an ancient Church who happened to be set, a fact of curious irony, within the most incurably heretical city of England. Newman's life in Birmingham, though not cloistered, was aloof from the rough and tumble. What may be said of it? Simply, and almost exclusively, that the finest spiritual autobiography in the English language emanated from the Oratory, that he preached a number of sermons which in mastery of his medium have hardly been approached before or since, that a stream of correspondence left his rooms to all parts of the Kingdom as long as he could hold a pen, that he conducted a hidden ministry to individual souls, and that, most incalculable of all, there was a ceaseless ascent of intercession from the simple altar of his little room at the Oratory and from within the solemn splendours of the Mass.

Dale's faith found its readiest expression in social reform. He has a kindred spirit here in Manning, but the righting of social injustices was a sphere alien to the genius of Newman to whom the camps of thought were his most congenial air. Not that his life was not full of kindnesses to the individual poor.

Yet widely as these two personalities differ, striking and significant resemblances may be traced. It is not merely that they were great and contemporary Christians, both masters of the pulpit medium, both champions of the certitude of faith against advancing and receding waves of 19th century rationalism and scepticism, but that there lies behind the convictions and activities of both men, revealed as patently as personal protestation and exterior fruits can reveal it, the indefeasible reality of mystical experience.

Nothing could be more tendentious than to emphasize the ethical passion of Dale to the obscuring of the essential mysticism from which it originated and by which it was nurtured. How he would have spurned the charge, so often laid against Protestantism, that it is no more than a moral code! *Ethos* had to him no meaning apart from *logos*. He affirms it at the outset to his ministry at Carrs Lane:

> He is called Emmanuel, God with us, and that not in a transient manifestation . . . but by a permanent and inseparable union. The Christian minister should strive to maintain that high fellowship of the heart with Christ—that habitual and profound recognition of things unseen—without which Christian virtue will be a feeble and worldly thing.

Hence

> In the tumult and heat of the world's business it is for him to make the hearts of his brethren familiar with the calm

eternity of God's life, and to make hope and energy aspire to that region of spiritual peace and triumph, so remote from many of us, in which the Christian man should dwell.

That habitual and profound recognition of things unseen. What note more reminiscent of Newman, who so constantly bids us view "what we see as a screen hiding from us God and Christ, His Saints and His Angels". Let us strive, cries Dale, for "the high fellowship of the heart with Christ". Let us seek, pleaded the quiet voice from St. Mary's a few years before, "the tender and sensitive heart which hangs on the thought of Christ and lives in His love".

Dale never lost this sense of the immediate revelation of truth through the Spirit of Truth to the saints of every Church. Eighteen years later, his faith richer and deeper, he reaffirms it:

> There is a region lying far beyond the limits which confine the activity of the intellect—a region whose infinite and transcendent glories and terrors cannot be represented under the forms of the logical understanding: it is there that those who are taught of the Spirit see divine visions and receive revelations of the Lord.

No one was less disposed than Dale to underrate the place of the reasoning faculty in religion, but he would have agreed with von Hugel, and so assuredly would Newman, when he says that "the intellectual is the more or less inadequate mental scaffolding, partly shaping, partly shaped by, those immanent experiences of transcendent realities, God, our own soul, and the community of its fellow souls.

This last phrase, "the community of fellow souls", leads us to consider a phase of Dale that was no less characteristic of him than it was of Newman. Newman's soul found succour and inspiration in the contemplation of the long line of Christian souls, and in the traditions of an august and hierarchical church. His *solus cum Solo* had to be supplemented by *cor ad cor loquitur*. But the High Churchmanship of the one was no greater than that of the other. Emphatically as Dale rejected the Roman theory of the Church and the Sacraments, he protested no less vehemently against the impoverished ideas of both which had become the unfortunate concomitant of the Evangelical Revival with its emphasis on individual salvation. Dale's doctrine of the Church was one long protest against unrestrained emphasis on individual experience whether genuinely mystical or the passing waves of emotional experience so often unwisely stimulated by the enthusiasts of the period. He is profoundly traditional and profoundly Catholic. The Church was a supernatural society whose acts had supernatural validity. The Church at worship identified itself with the eternal self-offering of Christ to the Father, and the aspirations of its members were as threads in the robe of the Bride of Christ. Nothing less than this

is adequate to his assertion of the "spiritual audacity" of historic Congregationalism in that it claimed the Living Presence wherever were gathered the "two or three".

Dale made "The Communion of Saints" the theme of a remarkable sermon at Swansea in 1871. (His perception of neglected richness in the doctrine explains his zeal as historian and defender of our own traditions, of the ministry of the beloved community with the quiet dignity of its services, its meetings, and its simple ritual.) He invites his hearers to draw from the supernatural strength of all those who, through Christ, have passed into the Kingdom of Heaven. But much more than this, in a moment of prophetic insight, he visualizes the breaking of the storm clouds upon European society: "within a century, within a generation, the storm may be upon us", and then . . . "if the gloom thickens and the terror comes, Jerusalem will rise amidst the darkness with her bulwarks of strength and her palaces of glory unshaken by the storm. For though in great tribulation the soul may long to be hidden under the shadow of God's wing and in the secret of the sanctuary, the stream of divine peace flows deepest not in solitary places but in the city of God, and it makes glad the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High". The Church, too, he saw as a vindication of the idea of human brotherhood so denied within industrial civilization. Honouring as he did the beloved community, of course his scorn of any hint of subservience of church to state was as uncompromising as Newman's, so also his rejection of a watery "Board School religion".

So with the sacraments. In 1833 the Congregational Union of England and Wales had been moved to issue a Declaration of Faith, Order, and Discipline, a document in form and content contrasting very unfavourably with the Savoy Declaration of 1658. In Dale's view it set forth an impoverished idea, wholly subjective in emphasis, as if the Supper had been devised by the Church as a medium of instruction or of remembrance rather than springing from divine appointment and rich with a divine reality. He attacks it from the Union Chair (1881) as unsparingly as Newman himself had attacked subjective and introspective readings of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. The Eucharist to Dale was no memorial only, no merely scenic representation of the Passion. It was the High Festival of the Risen Christ, a proclamation of the Real Presence, and as such a call of the Most High to adoring worship.

"The Church was formed for the express purpose of interfering with the world". This happens to be a sentence of Newman's. But how much easier it is to imagine it to be Dale's! Dale—who so identified himself with every effort at introducing righteousness into the murky corners of civic life in Birmingham, and whose faith

was the sole driving power behind his insistence that every manifestation of democracy must be subjected to the touchstone of the laws of Christ. He is an example of that most potent of combinations, the mystic with a flair for practical affairs. Believing, with Gore, that there is "a divine purpose in democracy", he interpreted this complex business of so fashioning mundane society that men might live therein as sons of God as a service essentially sacramental.

Such great Victorians have left us a rich legacy. To inherit it is to find wonder rekindled at the uniqueness, depth, and variety of the result when human personality responds to the touch of the divine.

WORTH NOTING

How absurd men are! They never use the liberties they have, they demand those they do not have. They have freedom of thought, they demand freedom of speech.

KIERKEGAARD, *Either/Or.*

I know an industrial district in a West of England city where the Christians are forming a community which has overleapt the barriers of denomination and which has recognized that in that city the nearest thing to a community sense is provided not by the city or the ward or the parish but by the street. The united Christian forces in that area are at work creating 'cells' in every street whose prime function it is to attack everything that separates and divides men and women and isolates them. They are shock troops attacking lovelessness and loneliness, superstition, ignorance and fear wherever they find them. They are infiltrating a grim industrialized and complex society with the imagination born of Christian discipleship.

MAX WARREN, . . . *But—Suppose He Was Right.*

THE AUTHORITY OF CONSCIENCE

By H. D. Lewis, M.A., B.Litt.

"Had it strength, as it had right, had it power as it had manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world"[1]. These are the celebrated words in which Butler affirms the supremacy of conscience. What does this involve?

We should first note the view against which the arguments of Butler are especially directed, a view which was not without some attractions even for so redoubtable a critic as Butler himself[2]. This is the view that some *rapprochement* must be effected between inclination and duty. It may appear strange that this view should have commended itself to thinkers who set out to vindicate the claims of morality. What we *want* to do is one thing, what we *ought* to do is another. And this seems so evident when it is presented in simple terms that we do not expect it to be doubted except by those who have come to repudiate the claims of morality altogether and thus, in seeking to account for what we normally regard as distinctively ethical standards, are openly seeking to explain them away.

But the view that our duty must somehow conform to what we want has an exceptionally powerful fascination which few, even among the most notable moral philosophers, have managed to resist. Eager to take up the challenge of a prevailing scepticism they have been apt to defeat their own purpose by commending our duties to us on the ground that it will be to our advantage, *in the long run,* to discharge them, that if we are sufficiently enlightened about our own interests, if we understand properly what our "real" self wants, we will not hesitate to obey our conscience.

The prevalence of this attitude in moral philosophy has been strikingly exhibited by Professor H. A. Prichard in his lecture on *Duty and Interest*. And if, as Professor Prichard shows, the profoundest thinkers have found it hard to avoid its allurement, the part that it plays in popular exhortation will hardly surprise us. We find, in fact, that the morality of rewards and punishment is no stranger to our pulpits and public platforms today, albeit the consuming fires must be fed with a new kind of fuel. Stories of the following kind have still a wide currency among the teachers of Christian brotherhood.

It is a story about Carlyle. A beggar woman is said to have presented herself in great distress at the door of a friend with whom

1 Sermons II, Sect. 219.

2 Sermons III, Sect. 226. For discussion see T. H. Green, *The Prolegomena to Ethics,* Sections 226-232, and C. D. Broad, *Five Types of Ethical Theory,* p. 80.

he was staying. She was turned away without any aid, but it transpired that she was the carrier of the germs of a violent plague which decimated the city of Edinburgh; and among the victims of the plague were the children of Carlyle's host. On this the comment of Carlyle seems to have been, "I had told him she was his sister".

The nauseating vulgarity of this distortion of Christian charity would hardly deserve notice were it not in fact typical of much that a misguided enthusiasm perpetrates still. Many writers who are anxious to establish the claims of individuals everywhere, independently of class or race, are apt to degrade their appeal to the level of a threat of what will happen to the more fortunate countries of the world if they pursue a policy of isolation or of exploitation of backward peoples. Thus Dr. Herbert Agar writes: "If we are betrayed by the eventual peace, then some Asiatic nation will arise as a genuine and unselfish emancipator, and the ensuing conflict will make the present war seem like only an amateurish rehearsal[3]". The threat is, no doubt, well-founded. But it has little to do with the message that it is the kingdoms of the world that are to become the Kingdom of God. The world was our parish long before it became a "narrowed world".

We must not toy, therefore, with any suggestion that conscience requires to be supported by considerations of our own advantage, although our own thoughts and interests may be of first importance as factors in the situation to which the judgments of conscience refer. In many matters we may further the interest of others best by minding our own concerns effectively—a matter of which Butler, to refer to him again, was fully aware. But such identity as we may be able to establish along these lines between our own welfare and that of others has nothing to do with the ethical reasons for considering the need of our neighbour as well as our own.

II.

Much more commendable than the attempt to find an extraneous source for the authority of conscience in the desire of the agent to benefit himself, or at least in some reaction of our own, is the view that our duties are determined directly by the aims or reactions of society. This imports into the "psychological" theories some semblance of the objectivity required by ethical standards. But the theories in question reveal their inadequacy when we note the strictures that we pass on the enactments and aims which could with most plausibility be regarded as the objects of a social purpose or approval. The cover which such theories afford to despotic practices will also be very evident at the present time. It is almost as dangerous to say "Beyond society nothing" as it is to say, with the Fascist, "Beyond the State nothing". The former procedure not

[3] Quoted by Dr. Albert Peel in *The Christian Basis of Democracy*, p. 73.

unnaturally culminates in the latter. And if it be urged[4] that the enactments of a particular community are to be criticized only in relation to the standards of some ideal society towards which particular societies are tending, and whose nature is to be discerned in the course of social evolution, then there is the reply that social evolution follows no pattern sufficiently rigid to guide us in this way, and that, even if it did, the superiority of any ultimate goal of social progress must be established on some ground other than the fact that it is later in time or accords with some pattern or trend of development hitherto. Usually the upholders of "psychological" views about ethical matters will be found to introduce an ultimate ethical conception surreptitiously into their gradation of higher and lower levels of progress. But to exhibit this effectively would require considerably more space than we can afford here. Some of the theories which we should have to examine are very ingenious. Moreover, the issue can only be settled, in the last analysis, by appeal to an immediate awareness of the distinctively ethical conceptions of "ought" and "value". If someone is prepared to accept the implications of ethical relativity, there is nothing we can do to argue him out of his position beyond making sure that he does understand the implications of his view. "Naturalistic" theories, to use the technical term, are not essentially inconsistent. I shall, therefore, content myself here with an affirmation of the view that we have an immediate awareness of ultimate ethical qualities. The authority of conscience thus lies in the fact that it is our means of discerning the uniquely ethical features of the situations in which we have to act. That its deliveries are not infallible, even when the facts are properly understood, does not warrant the search for some independent confirmation of its claims; for there is none.

III.

This brings us to what is for many persons the main obstacle to their acceptance of the ultimacy of ethical standards. As was observed, we have to be guided in the last analysis by our own consciences. But conscience is fallible and the most sincere person may find himself in great moral perplexity. This induces in many people one of two reactions: (a) To put their trust wholly in some external authority, such as a church or a state or some notable teacher. The dire consequences of so complete an abrogation of individual judgment have already been noted. (b) To conclude that, even if there is an ultimate right and wrong to the alternatives that confront us in practice, this has no practical significance. For the most that anyone can do is to act according to his lights. But

[4] As is done, for example, by Professor Julian Huxley and by C. H. Waddington; see *Science and Ethics*, by Waddington and others. A detailed discussion of Huxley's views by C. D. Broad may be found in *Mind*, October, 1944.

this seems to involve that vicious subjectivism from which escape is sought by making society, or some equally external authority, supreme. How can we break the circle? I think it has firstly to be clearly admitted that a man who is resolved to obey his conscience is a morally estimable person, whatever the nature of the course of action which his conscience requires of him. He will be doing his duty in the only sense that is important for the estimation of moral worth. But it is possible at the same time that his conduct is outwardly wrong. We do not blame him for this, for he has no other guide than his erring conscience. If this conscience is enlightened the agent will understand the wisdom of consulting others and of paying heed to the requirements of society. But whether or not he will feel obliged to do this will depend on the kind of conscience he possesses. And, to repeat, we judge a man morally, not in terms of the kind of conscience that he has, but in terms of his determination to abide by whatever his conscience requires. A faulty conscience may, indeed, be due to neglect in the past, but that has nothing to do with the strictly moral quality of the present action. We are guilty if we act in a way which we believe to be detrimental to the cultivation of a sound moral judgment. But moral ignorance is never itself a moral defect. And so when we censure the conduct of any person whom we consider to be faithfully following his own convictions, it can only be in a sense which does not directly raise the question of responsibility and praise or blame. We have, therefore, an outward or "objective" meaning of duty which does not directly affect moral worth and in respect of which it may be said that we can fail to do our duty without knowing our failure or, as the matter is sometimes put in somewhat paradoxical fashion, that we may have a duty to do what we consider to be wrong. And the importance of making clear this conception of "outward duty" is this. *Firstly,* we shall understand that we need not disapprove of the character of a person with whom we are at variance on ethical questions. This will enable us to deal in a much more reasonable way with the complicated situation created by varieties in our ethical opinions. While there is bound to be a point beyond which we cannot allow the honest fanatic to proceed unhindered, we shall find ourselves, even in the process of adopting measures of restraint, tolerant and patient. We shall be emphatic in our disagreement with others about ethical matters without casting any aspersions on their character, or being thought to do so; and we shall thus be franker as well as more tolerant in the exchange of ethical opinions than we are apt to be. But, *secondly,* not only shall we adopt a more reasonable attitude towards those whose convictions are opposed to our own, we shall also take considerably greater pains to ensure that our own convictions are as enlightened as they can be. The measures which can be adopted for this pur-

pose can hardly be discussed in brief space. We can only indicate the importance of realizing that there is an objective ethical standard which our conscience must always be reaching after. The more this is stressed the greater is the likelihood that we shall put our problems clearly to ourselves when we have to ask "what in particular ought I to do?" These matters, and the distinctions noted in this passage, have been much discussed of recent years[5]. They represent an important feature of advances which have been made recently in the study of ethical problems, and which ought to be more widely known.

IV.

There is especial need today to emphasize the ultimacy of ethical standards. For the hold that men have on these standards is bound to be strained in an age of transition. As the political changes which followed the great days of Periclean Athens, wars, and colonization, resulted in the Sophist movement, and as, at the beginning of the modern period in history, the Renaissance and the Reformation culminated in an extreme individualism whose force is far from spent, so, in recent times, the rapid advance of science, wars and industrial upheavals, favour most, in the sphere of morals, the view that standards of conduct have no basis more substantial and permanent than the conventions and enactments of society, or the convenience of the individual. The drifting and the disintegration which follows the spread of these sceptical views soon makes itself known and is not easily arrested. It cannot be the task of the theorist alone to arrest it. But his help is indispensable if the work of the prophet and reformer is to be made permanent. And some of the ways in which he can set about his task are plain.

He can show, *in the first place*, that there is nothing prejudicial to the authority of conscience in the changes in our duties which are due to a changed situation. What is right in one age or in one society may be wrong in another, and prevailing opinions are, moreover, among the factors to be considered in deciding finally what course should be followed. Circumstances may quite properly alter matters here without involving us in any *vicious* relativism. *In the second place*, it can be shown that many of our perplexities are due to sophistication, not so much in the sense of deliberately compounding for the sins "we have a mind to" but in the sense of taking too little pains to view all the aspects of our problem. It may be said without smugness that a substantial part of our ethical difficulties would be seen to have little foundation if we brought to the study of them a greater comprehensiveness. Many good examples of the limitations that may go with notable ethical insight

[5] *Cf.* W. D. Ross, *The Right and the Good;* W. B. Joseph, *Some Problems in Ethics;* E. F. Carritt, *The Theory of Morals.*

are found in the history of the course of ethical enlightenment. The Greek philosophers, for instance, acquired a fine understanding of the virtue of temperance but it did not have much significance for them outside the sphere of physical appetite. Certain forms of courage, again, went unappreciated by the Greeks. The Greeks had also a very limited view of the persons towards whom they had obligations. The city state usually set a limit to their responsibilities. But the range of the principles which the Greeks discovered became extended in later ages to new activities and a wider society. This development was required by those principles themselves. And some ethical writers have been so impressed by this aspect of the matter that they have regarded conscientiousness as the sole and sufficient condition of ethical insight, in some cases crediting the good man with infallibility. That is an extreme and mistaken view. For ethical insight is not infallible, and the factual information on which our judgments depend is imperfect. It is none the less important to have it established how considerable a difference to the reliability of ethical opinions would be made by a greater impartiality and a greater readiness to submit the whole of our relationship with others to the control of ethical principles. *In the third place,* it has to be emphasized that much of the variability of ethical opinions can be reduced to differences about matters of fact. Many writers have recently shown[6] how opinions diametrically opposite one another may be formed about ethical matters without involving disagreement about the *strictly* ethical issues. Here again we have not a complete explanation of ethical disputes and perplexity. But we have a consideration which, by minimizing the extent to which our consciences may mislead us about the matters with which it is its proper business to deal, will induce also a greater readiness to accept the objectivity and reality of the standards about which conscience claims to enlighten us. *Finally,* it is important to ensure that confidence in ethical principles is not undermined by the false construction that is so often put on unavoidable moral perplexity. Hence the importance of the distinctions outlined in the preceding section.

V.

There are many who would endorse the main submissions of this paper, as we have advanced them hitherto, but who regard the status of ethical principles as still very precarious unless some foundation be found for them in a reality other than themselves. Man is not "the measure", but what then? Do we not require a metaphysical theory or religion as the guarantee of the objectivity and validity of morals? This is an illusion which religious persons find it very hard to abandon. But to cherish it is an ill service alike to religion and ethics. This does not imply that there is no

[6] *Cf.* A. E. Taylor, *Some Features of Butler's Ethics,* third N.S. xxxv. p. 289.

very close relation between morality and religion. The importance of ethical ideas for our view of reality as a whole is a metaphysical principle to our appreciation of which the present century may well have a distinctive contribution to make, as Mr. H. Osborne suggests in *The Philosophy of Value*. And if it be argued merely that the ideas of value and duty resemble every other idea, for example, the principles of mathematics, in deriving from the nature of the universe as a whole, and point in the final analysis to metaphysics, then I, for one, will certainly not wish to quarrel with that view. But it is quite another matter to hold that ethical truths are directly dependent on religious ones. The subject of the relation of religion to morality is a vast and difficult one, and it is not easy to say anything about it in brief compass without danger of misunderstanding. But we must take the risk and protest against persistence in a belief which is so untenable[7] that adherence to it cannot but do considerable harm to the cause of religion. We never, in practice, accept the implications of that view by relieving the honestly irreligious person of his ethical responsibilities, and we shall be very ill-advised if we allow the hold of our age on moral standards to be too closely identified with a return to a full religious life. The return is certain to be delayed by that policy. And we may also find that we have opened the door for the surreptitious entry of a vicious subjectivism.

[7] This subject is very carefully discussed by A. C. Ewing in his article, Ethics and Belief in God, *The Hibbert Journal*, Vol. XXXIV. I am in full agreement with him when he says, p. 378, "I conclude that ethics cannot be derived from theology but must rather come first. It does not follow that it may not serve as the basis of an argument for the existence of God".

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

By "List P".

Through the kindly offices of a neighbour I received appointment as a Presiding Officer (P.O. for short) for a polling station in the Z Division of the Borough of X at the General Election. I looked forward to learning something of how things were done, and besides, there was a fee. A full account of my experiences would be boring, but reflections on it may be of wider interest.

The amateur, almost casual conduct of an election came as a surprise. I suppose the fact that there had not been even a municipal election for over six years made this aspect more marked than usual. A good many P.O.s were new hands, and those who had previous experience had grown rusty. Nor was the support of the police always available: until six o'clock there was only one constable to every two polling places, let alone stations. We received sundry leaflets of instructions, and a ten-minute talk from the Acting Returning Officer, in the course of which he gave a merciful and reasonable measure of relaxation to the rigour of the printed legal requirements. But we had no practical demonstration of procedure, nor previous introduction to the forms which had to be filled up. As most P.O.s were officials in Local or National government service, capacity to fill up forms might have been taken for granted, but the calculations required did not seem so simple at the close of a tiring day. Then there were the Service Proxy voters: every P.O. will hope that the next election will see the service men and women back home, or else that better procedure can be devised for their voting. At many voting stations, mine included, mistakes were made before a fuller instruction was circulated during the forenoon. I had refused papers to two proxies who were entitled to have them: fortunately I was able to send messages, and both charitably came again and recorded their proxy votes.

Another interesting point is the way in which it is left to the various party agencies to notify electors of the place where they are to vote. Several people who had "lost their cards" came to my station in error. There was outside a list of all the polling stations in the constituency, but it was so summary in its description of the streets concerned as to be of very little help, unless there had been a full copy of the register to supplement it. The police were equally baffled here.

My pitch was in a Congregational Church Hall. It had been requisitioned throughout the war as a First-Aid Post. I ascertained afterwards that it was still in the hands of the local authority. The

Church I knew well, a struggling but lively cause in the heart of a "working class" district, at present without a minister. I was afraid that its members would have had no opportunity to do anything, and as the hall was still theirs only in name, so it proved. When I arrived on election day I found my clerk gazing around in the chill light of dawn—4.45 a.m. by Greenwich Time! One or two windows still retained a permanent blackout: the rest were dingy yellow from lack of cleaning. Window ledges and heating pipes were thick in dust. The only furniture was the polling stations, each consisting of a bare trestle table with a couple of chairs, and a row of polling booths from which the dust of years had been roughly removed. A few electric bulbs made the gloom more visible. Provision for ventilation there seemed to be none except two broken panes: these were welcomed later in the day as the heat increased. Three sinks remained from the first-aid days, but there was no gas supply to the water-heaters. However, a teapot suggested possibilities, and an exploration of the alleys behind the building led to a kitchen with a kettle and a "live" gas ring, a veritable oasis in a wilderness of paths in poor repair covered with dust and scattered bits of coke. I learned subsequently that the water, gas and electricity had been reconnected for that day only. My clerk proved as good at tea-making as at her electoral duties, and we did not suffer from thirst despite the dust and heat. In view of the circumstances it was not surprising that from first to last we had no glimpse of any caretaker or other person interested in our physical welfare. But I was very sorry that my clerk and the staff of the other polling station should receive such an impression of Congregational church premises: the civic authorities took no steps to indicate that they themselves still held the building under their own charge.

The party canvassers in the street outside also put in a fourteen-hour day with few intermissions. The "National" representative was a middle-aged woman, for whose benefit we borrowed a chair from a side storeroom: two young blondes upheld the Liberal interest: Labour had two schoolboys, and there were generally several other boys and girls around. The children of the district certainly extracted all possible enjoyment from the election. We had no difficulty in getting messengers for various errands. One boy knew where to get a bottle of milk; another had a piece of chalk when I wanted to make a notice to guide voters to the right table. Chalk was an omission from the very full provision of stationery in the equipment supplied: the only other omission was any means of lighting the tapers used for the sealing-wax. I suppose the authorities are justified in assuming that some means of obtaining a light will always be available at a polling place. To return to the canvassers, they were on the friendliest terms with one another, and collaborated

freely in securing the information they sought, with good-humoured banter about their respective party favours.

The voters showed by their demeanour that they knew what they were doing and intended it to count. Some of the younger ones, exercising their citizenship rights for the first time, obviously felt that the procedure was too simple and bare after all the speeches they had heard about their great and grave responsibility. "Is that all?" was asked more than once, with the implication that so serious an act required greater ceremony. There was a steady trickle all through the day: the rush came for only half an hour in mid-evening. The last two to vote did so on the stroke of nine: half an hour later one man came along and seemed surprised to learn that he was too late. No knotty points arose at my station. The chief difficulty was to get people accustomed to collaboration to observe the secrecy of the ballot. Several husbands wanted to show their wives what to do: in one or two cases it was the other way round: and sisters with the habit of consulting together found it hard to be kept apart. One old lady who came with three friends had some eye trouble, but declared that she could see to vote. Her friends obviously did not think so, and regarded me as an unkindly interferer when I insisted that she be left to herself. As elsewhere, there were gaps in the register: I was most sorry for the man who had recently moved to work in another town and had come back for the express purpose of voting, only to find that he could not.

By the close of the day three-quarters of the electors on my register had voted, and the other station in the hall reported a heavier poll. Perhaps the worst part of the day for P.O.s was to follow: clerks had finished their duties. We had to wait some time with our sealed ballot boxes and other packages for the official bus which was to come and take us to the central store where these were to be kept until the day of counting. When the vehicle came we were taken on a tour of back and side streets, collecting other P.O.s and their impedimenta together with some policemen, until with a full load we reached the central depot. There we were decanted to join a long queue of earlier arrivals, while other buses brought further additions. The queue moved slowly, but in due course I came to its forward end, and found that the ballot boxes were being received one at a time, and that each of the three accompanying packages had to be checked for superscription and, in some cases, for contents. Many of the P.O.s did not get home until midnight: one of them had a six-mile walk which made it 1.30: and the next day all would have to be at business as usual. Many were elderly, and at the end of a tiring day. Yet they stood in resigned cheerfulness, and the grumbles and complaints were good-humoured. It was all in the day's work. The same spirit prevailed during the two mornings of the sorting and counting of the votes.

If any generalizations are permissible from this very small cross-section of the election, they would show that the voting was undertaken seriously, with consideration of issues, and that it was felt to be worth while. If the members who have been returned to Parliament set about their duties in the same spirit as the electors who returned them, and as the officers who carried out the duties of the poll, then the country should not be badly served. But the electorate deserves that its representatives, and in particular the leaders, furnish it with the information required for serious decisions. The real issues of the day need to be set out, without any concealment under screens of political prejudice. For people who are not trusted are bound to become irresponsible. Let politicians who uphold adult education set an example in their own practice.

The Christian observer can derive little comfort. How is it that the Christian Church has lost, in the eyes of men, its relevance to a situation in which spiritual issues are fundamental, and are not unrecognized? Is it that the people are demanding only what is not in its power to give? Why is it that it is handicapped by the withholding of its equipment, and yet has its name brought down into the dust? (for I imagine that the story of my polling place is far from unique). Or is this a measure of retribution for its tendency to think too much of property and not enough of persons[1]? What is the Word of Good News that shall possess it and through it reach the people of this land? On the morrow of the declaration of the poll such are some of the questions I am asking myself.

[1] *Note.*—This statement is meant to be of general application. The particular congregation referred to in the article cannot have this charge laid at its door.

POETS IN UNIFORM

(A Comparison of the Work of the Soldier-Poets of the Great War with that of the Contemporary War-Poets)

By Horton Davies, M.A., B.D., D.Phil.

Now that we have come to the end of the Second World War, poetry-lovers are in a position to put the question: Are there any contemporary war-poets and how does their achievement compare with that of the soldier-poets of the Great War? The time is not yet ripe, of course, for a mature consideration of the poetry of this war for two reasons. Firstly, because the number of contemporary English poets greatly exceeds the mere handful of soldier-poets in the last war. Secondly, much contemporary poetry lies embedded in ephemeral publications, such as magazines or pamphlets. At the same time enough contemporary poetry has been disinterred from magazines to make possible the publication of representative anthologies. Such editors as Keidrych Rhys and Tambimuttu have already produced three anthologies of war-time poetry between them. These alone would make it possible to offer a tentative estimate of the significance of this poetry. But, apart from such anthologies and Hogarth's series, *The Poets of Tomorrow,* several poets have already published collections of their verse. Such poets, to take but a few instances, are: Sidney Keyes, John Heath-Stubbs, John Pudney, Alan Rook, Anne Ridler, C. Day Lewis, Stephen Spender, David Gascoyne, and Vernon Watkins.

One of the chief difficulties in the way of attempting a comparison between the poetry of this war and the last, is the remarkable increase in the number of practising poets. I suppose that any list of the poets of the Great War would be a short one: the leading poets could be numbered on ten fingers. When you have recited the names of Rupert Brooke, Wilfred Owen, Siegfried Sassoon, Julian Grenfell, Robert Nichols, and Edmund Blunden, there are few omissions. By contrast a list of the war-poets of today might easily number four dozen. (One glance at the names of the leading contributors to Rhys's *Poems from the Forces* would establish this point.) For this reason, quotations of contemporary poets will be almost entirely confined to those whose compositions have outlived the transient popularity of a magazine, and have been collected.

1. Attitude towards the War

A comparison between the poets of the last war and this should begin with a record of their reactions to the conflict. In the Great War two prevalent responses found their voices in poetry. The first

was the romantic, idealist attitude of Rupert Brooke. It found typical expression in Rupert Brooke's sonnet "Peace":

Now God be thanked Who has matched us with His hour,
And caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping,
With hand made sure, clear eye, and sharpened power,
To turn as swimmers into cleanness leaping,
Glad from a world grown old and cold and weary,
Leave the sick hearts that honour could not move,
And half-men, and their dirty songs and dreary,
And all the little emptiness of love.

For him the war was a crusade for the preservation of spiritual values:

Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.

Brooke did not, of course, think that war was only the revival of chivalry, or marching behind proud pennants to the sound of trumpets. But even the sombre undertones of his poems romanticize death as a lover's leap:

Nothing to shake the laughing heart's long peace there
But only agony, and that has ending;
And the worst friend and enemy is but Death.

A more realistic attitude towards the war was found in the poems of Siegfried Sassoon and Wilfred Owen. Sassoon's verse is often no more than a prolonged snarling at the incompetence of brass-hats who sent men to their death:

If I were fierce and bald and short of breath,
I'd live with scarlet Majors at the Base,
And speed glum heroes up the line to death.

The Muse has turned cynical. His "Memorial Tablet" is in the same vein, with its ironic conclusion:

Once I came home on leave; and then went west.
What greater glory could a man desire?

This attitude, naïve in its selection of scape-goats, was a necessary astringent after the romanticism of Brooke. It flowered most finely in the poems of Wilfred Owen. Here realism and pity have joined hands. Owen conceived it to be his duty to tell the unvarnished and often repulsive truth about war, as a prophet warning future generations. The cynicism of Sassoon has been transmuted into the compassion of Owen. He wrote in the preface to his collected poems: "My subject is War, and the Pity of War. The Poetry is in the Pity. Yet these elegies are to this generation in no sense consolatory. They may be to the next. All that a poet can do today is to warn. That is why the true Poets must be truthful".

Owen's mission in poetry, as he sees it, is to relate the sordid details of the carnage in order to explode the myth that war is a noble and glorious exploit. He tells how one man was gassed:

In all my dreams before my helpless sight
He plunges at me, guttering, choking, drowning.
If in some smothering dreams, you too could pace
Behind the wagon that we flung him in,
And watch the white eyes writhing in his face,
His hanging face, like a devil's sick of sin;
If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood
Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs,
Bitter as the cud
Of vile, incurable sores on innocent tongues,—
My friend, you would not tell with such high zest
To children ardent for some desperate glory,
The old Lie: *Dulce et decorum est*
Pro patria mori.

The very titles of his poems are a further indication that he intends to stab his readers awake to the realization of the horrors of war. "Mental Cases", "Exposure", "Disabled", "Spring Offensive", and the superb "Anthem for Doomed Youth" define the realistic attitude.

It is not to be wondered at that contemporary war-poets are of Owen's company and not of Brooke's. Total war lends itself even less than the Great War did to romantic treatment. It is not, however, to be inferred that the poets in the services today are mere echoes of Owen. His poems could fairly be described as pacifist propaganda. His verse was itself a war upon wars. The contemporary poets are fully aware of the pity and the tragic waste of warfare. But they regard the present war as a judgment on the nations that condoned evil by their callous indifference to the victims of Nazism and Fascism, and also as an opportunity of striking tyranny at its roots. Fearful and ghastly as war is, the poets would appear to regard the possible Nazification of Europe as a greater calamity.

Anne Ridler expresses the contemporary attitude to the conflict in her poem, "Now as Then". It would, in her opinion, be hypocrisy to regard the Second World War simply as a crusade, although our forefathers were more confident:

When under Edward or Henry the English armies
Whose battles are brocade to us and stiff in tapestries
On a green and curling sea set out for France,
The Holy Ghost moved the sails, the lance
Was hung with glory, and in all sincerity
Poets cried "God will give us the victory".

This attitude is no longer possible, by contrast:

For us, who by proxy inflicted gross oppression,
Among whom the humblest have some sins of omission,
War is not simple; in more or less degree
All are guilty, though some will suffer unjustly. . . .

Yet since of two evils our victory would be the less
And coming soon, leave some strength for peace,
Like Minot and the rest, groping we pray
"Lord turn us again, confer on us victory!"

The attitude is what the late Archbishop Temple defined as "a conditional justification of war". That qualification does not make for confident poetry. Indeed the war-poets of today are well aware of it. C. Day Lewis admits this:

It is the logic of our times
No subject for immortal verse—
That we who lived by honest dreams
Defend the bad against the worse.

2. A Comparison of Techniques

The next difference between the two sets of war-poets is that of technique. Rupert Brooke wrote in the traditional sonnet-form. Owen employed the same form for some of his compositions. At the same time Owen was an innovator. He used free verse to a great extent and he tried out para-rhymes with great effect. It is true, however, that however unconventional the themes of the poets of the Great War, their styles were fairly conventional. By contrast, much modern poetry is regarded as "difficult" or "obscure" or "tortuous". The traditional sonnet technique is employed with striking success by Wilfred Owen in "Anthem for Doomed Youth". This poem is an elaborate metaphor, perfectly sustained. Owen describes the mourning for the fallen on the battle-field, as the equivalent of a Catholic requiem.

What passing bells for those who die as cattle?
Only the monstrous angers of the guns.
Only the stuttering rifle's rapid rattle
Can patter out their hasty orisons.
No mockeries for them from prayers or bells,
Nor any voice of mourning save the choirs,—
The shrill demented choirs of wailing shells;
And bugles calling for them from sad shires.

What candles may be held to speed them all?
Not in the hands of boys, but in their eyes
Shall shine the holy glimmer of good-byes.
The pallor of girls' brows shall be their pall;
Their flowers the tenderness of silent minds,
And each slow dusk a drawing-down of blinds.

In each sentence the parallel between the two requiems is carefully maintained. The onomatopœic use of words could not be bettered: sound and sense blending in perfect harmony. By comparison the poetry of our contemporaries appears obscure, contorted, difficult.

If contemporary war-poetry is to be appreciated at its full value, the reader must allow for the different technique of modern poetry.

The difficulty experienced is due mainly to concentration of thought. This difficulty, as Louis MacNeice reminds us in "Modern Poetry", is "to be referred to its *cutting*—to borrow a term from the cinema. Many modern poets leave out those links between idea and image which earlier poets would have inserted". The result is that some modern poems read like telegrams. At times they are more like messages in code. But this compression of meaning has two advantages: it enables the poet to surprise his readers and it conveys the quick transition of his thoughts.

This difficulty in technique is also occasionally due to the unfamiliar diction of the verse. Modern poets cast their net widely: their haul includes such strange fish as technical terms or conversational terms, hitherto banned as "unliterary".

A typical example of disconnected verse, deliberately so, in order to convey the impression of a nightmare, is the following, taken from David Gascoyne's "The Uncertain Battle":

> Down through a raw black hole in heaven stared
> The horror-blanched moon's eye. Across the swamp
> Five ravens flapped.

An example of an implicit metaphor (*i.e.*, one in which idea and image are not overtly linked) is:

> . . . wasps that cannot fertilise
> dive at the open flowers of men.

The wasp is, of course, a German bomber (possibly, a Messerschmidt). The unproductive machine is contrasted with the man who made it but is murdered by it. This and further meanings are compressed into a "telegram" of two lines.

The careful use of conversational diction is exemplified in the following quotation from Sidney Keyes's "Elegy":

> April again and it is a year again
> Since you walked out and slammed the door
> Leaving us tangled in your words . . .
> It is a year again since they poured
> The dumb ground into your mouth.

There is effective understatement in the words "walked out" and "slammed". Justification for the use of unpoetical words in poetry can be found in the employment of the prosaic word "flatness" in "Air-Raid Casualties" by Patricia Ledward of the A.T.S.:

> The young wife, with husband full of shot,
> Kisses his brow and quickly walks away,
> Her eyes on the stalwart boughs that sway
> Still seeing the flatness of his sheets.

Our contemporary poets are suspicious of "literary" epithets. For that reason they are hammering out a new currency in diction. They will not be content with words that are insulated from life.

At the same time they are capable of producing brilliant and

apposite images from their day-to-day experience. Consider, for example, how two different poets describe searchlights criss-crossing the sky. T. R. Hodgson in "Searchlights over Berlin" writes:

> Their silver scalpels probe the wound of night
> Seeking our doom, a death
> to death . . .
> And he is rising mad who searches here
> for meaning.

Desmond Hawkins also uses a medical comparison, but differently:

> The night sky
> Throbbed under the cool bandage of the searchlights.

Perhaps the finest example of a poem with sustained metaphors, comparable in some ways to Owen's "Anthem", is Day Lewis's "Ode to Fear".

3. A Comparison of Themes

Both sets of war-poets naturally employ many of the same themes, because they are writing in the time of upheaval. Modern poets write on the ironic tenderness of guns, which are now their pets. We can set beside Wilfred Owen's sonnet, "On seeing a piece of our artillery in action", Gavin Ewart's "Bofors A.A. Gun":

> Such marvellous ways to kill a man!
> An "instrument of precision", a beauty,
> The well-oiled shining marvel of our day
> Points an accusing finger at the sky.
> —But suddenly, traversing, elevating madly
> It plunges into action, more than eager
> For the steel blood of those romantic birds
> That threaten all the towns and roads.

Both sets of poets sing of the paradox of war, that saves life by dealing death; the transience of happiness; the futility, the waste, the horror of war; the valour and the pathos.

Contemporary poets can be as realistic as Owen was in describing the terrors of warfare. Kenneth Neal leaves nothing to the imagination:

> The ground reeled and smacked his face
> He cried; light burst and splintered in his brain,
> Blackness collapsed in halls of breaking glass,
> Pain was life's last joke, the god he knew then.

In this war, however, poets have a greatly extended range of themes. The background of the last war was almost exclusively France and Flanders. The consequence was that mud and trenches, barbed wire and rifles, shells and Verey-lights, grenades and tanks, figured almost monotonously in their poems. This time mobile warfare, and the new importance of the aeroplane, have added other dimensions to the picture of horror. France and Eng-

land, North Africa, Italy, Burma present a variegated backcloth for the war-artist in verse.

Another factor also helps to explain the diversity of themes and outlooks expressed in modern war-poetry. That is the early introduction of conscription. This involved the calling-up of men and women from all strata of our social life. The poet is thus in his mess in touch with a complete cross-section of life. This has also meant that in this war, instead of soldier poets we have poets in all three services. Furthermore, increasing specialization in training has provided poets with a less homogeneous experience than the soldier poets had in the last war. All these factors contribute to the multiformity of war-experience.

It may also be that the apparent lack of idealism in contemporary war poetry is partly due to the early introduction of conscription. During the Great War, when only volunteers gave their lives for freedom in the first two years, the concept of sacrifice had more meaning than in the present conflict.

Time and space forbid the description of the contribution that the three different services have made to war-poetry. It will be possible, however, to consider the effect of aerial warfare on modern poetry. The added dimension of horror which the aeroplane has brought to war is finely expressed in Day Lewis's remarkable "Ode to Fear". This begins:

> The lustre bowl of the sky
> Sounds and sustains
> A throbbing cello-drone of planes.
> Entombed beneath this caving liberty
> We note how doom endorses
> Our devious fraud and folly where skeins
> Of wild geese flew direct on visionary courses.

The poem is a parable of the irresponsibility of man; the result is:

> Now fear has come again to live with us
> In poisoned intimacy like pus,
> Hourly extending the area of our pain. . . .

The medical metaphor of man as a feverish patient is excellently sustained:

> Fear has so many symptoms—
> Planes throbbing above
> Like headache, rumours that glibly move
> Along the bloodstream, sleep's prophetic phantoms
> Concerning what we have built,
> Heartburn anxiety for what we love—
> And all, yes all, are proof of an endemic guilt.

A variation on the same theme is provided by a picture of London battered and bruised after the raids of 1941. Mervyn Peake offers this poetic report:

Half-masonry, half pain; her head
From which the plaster breaks away
Like flesh from the rough bone, is turned
Upon a neck of stones; her eyes
Are lidless windows of smashed glass,
Each star-shaped pupil
Giving upon a vault so vast
How can the head contain it?

Alan Rook embroiders the same theme in "Bombed City", where

The churches lay the sorrow
of their bricks across the pavement
and houses no longer
cut the sky with swords.

Woman lies with
city to her breast
crushed by the towers
and pain of mortar.

Child lies with
tourniquet of fear
and on his lips
the milk of death.

Aerial warfare is also the theme of an elegy by Stephen Spender, entitled "In Memoriam". This poet writes savagely of the tasks and the rewards of our pilots:

Driven by intolerance and volted with lies
We melt down the whirring bodies of boys
And their laughter distil
To plough metal hatred through the skies
And write with their dreams over burning cities
Sure no summer joys,
There where everything stops but the wishes that kill.

These poets have chronicled the war in the air, and many others such as Timothy Corsellis (A.T.A.), David Bourne, John Pudney, and Henry Treece. The war on the land is portrayed by Sidney Keyes (a poet of exceptional promise who fell in North Africa), J. F. Hendry, Alun Lewis, Laurie Little, Keidrych Rhys, Alan Rook and Francis Scarfe, and by many others. The Royal Navy has fewer poets, though they include such names as Roy Fuller (Fleet Air Arm), John Prichard, Norman Hampson, Gervase Stewart, and Richard Wright.

Their names are alone sufficient proof of the variety of angles from which the contemporary poets view the "seat of Mars".

4. Attitude to Religion

The last war did not engender any specifically religious poetry. In that respect the present conflict is an improvement. The major-

ity of the contemporary poets who are not apostles of despair, are more attracted by the gospel of Marx than by the Gospel of Mark. At the same time certain of the modern poets are aware of the relevance of Christ.

One would hesitate to call either J. F. Hendry or Francis Scarfe a Christian, yet the former sees our Lord as the One "who hath broken down the middle wall of partition" and in Whom men can find reconciliation:

> Still, a man in Galilee whose seas know no division
> Walks the waves of anger with his love.
> With his blood and with his tears treads down
> Fountains of green vengeance.

Francis Scarfe sees the relevance of Christ's way in the midst of the brutalities of war:

> Sweet Christ, have mercy on my friend and foe
> Who maim their souls with every soul they kill;
> Sweet Christ, whose blood has never ceased to flow
> Pardon all those who shoot against their will.
>
> Have greater pardon on all those who cry
> Their hymns of violence and spur us on
> To everlasting death; teach us to live, not die;
> Be with us now and for ever, O gentle One.

Surely these "are not far from the Kingdom of God"? Only three of the younger contemporary poets are conspicuously Christian: Norman Nicholson, Anne Ridler, and David Gascoyne. The latter has produced definitely religious poems. Such compositions as "De Profundis", "Miserere", and "Ex Nihilo" are the transcripts of a deep religious experience. The poem last mentioned, in particular, shows that this poet understands the Apostle's dictum: "we walk by faith and not by sight:

> Hand that I love! Lord Light
> How dark is Thy arm's will and iron-like
> Thy ruler's finger that has sent me here!
> Far from Thy Face I nothing understand,
> But kiss the Hand that has consigned
>
> Me to these latter years where I must learn
> The revelation of despair, and find
> Among the debris of all certainties
> The hardest stone on which to found
> Altar and shelter for eternity.

The Christ of this ardent revolutionary's faith is not the Christ of the contemporary Church. Gascoyne identifies present-day Christians as the supporters of a waning capitalism:

He is in agony until the world's end,
And we must never sleep during that time!
He is suspended on the cross-tree now
And we are onlookers at the crime,
Callous contemporaries of the slow
Torture of God.

Then comes the accusation:

Behind His lolling head the sky
Glares like a fiery cataract
Red with the murders of two thousand years
Committed in His name by
Crusaders, Christian warriors
Defending faith and property.

The modern war-poets, as we have seen, are many and varied in their themes and approaches. This, however, can be said of almost all of them. They are not escapists; they have ceased to believe in poetry for poetry's sake. They will not sidle away from life to wander in the green caverns of fancy like hermit-crabs. They are the chroniclers of contemporary heroism and tragedy. Occasionally, they are not only historians, they are also prophets. As, for instance, Alan Rook in "The Retreat":

I know that the evil in our nature
Is our fear of history, our incapacity to suffer,
And our poor cold dread of the crises of the future.

The prophetic notes of warning and denunciation are sounded more clearly by Day Lewis:

Will it be so again—
The jungle code and the hypocrite gesture?
A poppy-wreath for the slain
And a cut-throat world for the living?

Shall it be so again?
Call not upon the glorious dead
To be your witnesses then.
The living alone can nail to their promises the ones who said
It shall not be so again.

Enough has been cited to prove that the modern war-poets have proved their mettle as observers and interpreters of the war-time scene. It would be unwise to attempt to judge whether their contribution to poetry is greater than that made by the soldier-poets of the Great War. No comparisons can be made between roses grown in neatly cultivated rows and cacti blooming scarlet on the arid green sand of the desert. The most that can be said is that both are excellent of their kind.

PASTOR AND PEOPLE

[Under this heading competent writers of various denominations will deal with pastoral problems which confront ministers in the course of their ordinary work. We invite readers to suggest subjects. The following article is intended simply as an introduction to the series.]

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE MINISTER

By Leslie J. Tizard

A medical psychologist was talking about his work to a minister. Like most of his profession he was an overworked man. His main job was the superintending of a great mental institution with some two thousand resident patients, but, as is the way with such men, he did all sorts of other things to fill in his spare time! He was then running psychological clinics for out-patients at a couple of hospitals which he visited once a week. The whole thing, he said, was profoundly unsatisfactory. How could he give the patients who crowded to his clinics the help they needed? Nobody knew better than he that some of them ought to have an hour to themselves every time he saw them, and yet he had to deal with a whole lot of patients in the course of a single afternoon. Then he said abruptly to the minister: "Most of these patients should never have come to me; they should have gone to you". He was, of course, speaking to that particular minister as the representative of his profession. He meant that, if those patients had in the first place taken their troubles to a minister equipped with some understanding of human nature and gifted with sympathy, they would never have become mentally—and perhaps physically—ill. They would not have generated within themselves pent-up anxiety which, in the end, could be released only by the prolonged efforts of a specialist. Although he was too kind to say it in so many words, this doctor was really telling us parsons that we are not doing our job; we are neglecting one side of it pretty badly. So far as it is being done at all we are putting it on to the shoulders of overworked people like himself, whose highly trained skill and specialized knowledge should be kept for those who are so seriously ill that no one less qualified can help them. Was the doctor right in his implied accusation?

We have sometimes been asked to talk to groups of ministers and clergy about pastoral work. We have been amazed to hear men, who have been in the ministry for years, saying that it is the rarest thing in the world for anybody to consult them about moral and emotional troubles. People come to them when forms have to be signed or Johnny has to be found a job, but they never come to

talk about their real troubles. What is even more disturbing is that some ministers seem to be rather relieved that they don't. They frankly confess that they would not know what to say, and if (worst of all horrors!) somebody should come to them with a really "sticky" sexual problem they would be covered with confusion.

In so far as they fail to deal adequately with the personal problems of their people many ministers are not entirely to be blamed. They have the will but not the knowledge. There was little or nothing in their training which could provide them with the necessary equipment or put them in the way of obtaining it. When the older men were in college the only psychology available was of the academic type, and the student could absorb all the textbooks ever written about it without being one whit the wiser when he entered the ministry and was confronted with the emotional problems of real, live people. For a generation now the "New Psychology" has made accessible a good deal of knowledge about human nature, which is of the utmost practical value, yet it is true to say that so far singularly little use has been made of it in the training of the ministry. It has rightly been regarded as essential to give the student a sound grasp of the gospel he is called to preach, but it has not seemed equally important to provide him with a knowledge of the people to whom he is going to preach it. He has been taught a great deal about the seed he is to sow but next to nothing about the soil in which he is to plant it. Consequently he has known a fair amount of theology, as it was necessary he should, but he has not been able to apply his knowledge as effectively as he might have done because he has not sufficient insight into the real nature of the people with whom he has to deal. If he was a diligent student in college days he can argue an atheist out of court and he can give weighty answers to the intellectual doubters who may consult him. But perhaps he does not know, for nobody has ever told him, that the grounds of that very atheism or doubt are quite possibly not intellectual, in which case all the arguments in the world will never make any headway. And he has not been in the ministry long before he is aware that most people have very little in the way of intellectual problems which really trouble them, but a good many emotional difficulties, some of which make havoc of their lives. Indeed, he may have found, to his utter dismay, that his theological learning has not enabled him to deal effectively with the problems of his own personality. He may even suspect that somehow his emotions, now and then, get mixed up with his own thinking and give a twist to his theological beliefs!

It must be confessed that the ministry has been slower than many other professions to make use of the knowledge which the fast developing science of psychology has to offer. Social workers, for example, realized long ago that as their jobs required them to

deal with *people,* they must know all they could about them. In the early 1920's there were great developments in the application of psychology to the case-work of social workers, for these years "saw the wider appreciation of the work and the ideas of Freud and Jung, and of the more orthodox medical psychologists. In America, the psychiatric approach, as it came to be called, was wholeheartedly, even enthusiastically, adopted to the displacement of the factual approach. . . . Psychiatric social work in America originated with the attachment of social workers to Mental Hospitals, previously to the last war. About the same time, increasing attention was being given to the treatment of delinquent and difficult children, which eventually bore fruit in the establishment of Child Guidance Clinics. In these clinics the 'team' consists of the Medical Psychiatrist, Educational Psychologist, and Psychiatric Social Worker. In the post-war period the movement took root in this country, and with the generous and far-sighted help of the Commonwealth Fund of America, a nucleus of Psychiatric Social Workers was trained in the United States, and a training course established in this country. The contribution of psychiatric social workers to casework is already considerable. Their association with the medical profession has given them the professional approach and the insistence on professional standards which are so valuable in any therapeutic rôle. Their psychological training has given them the ability to evaluate the emotional factor in the client, and in the worker-client relationship, which is of immense assistance in the casework field. In the Association of Psychiatric Social workers they have a most alert and progressive professional organisation[1]".

Educationists awakened to the need for applying psychology when they began to see that their real function is not to teach "subjects" but boys and girls. (Incidentally, subjects, like the gospel, cannot be "got over" as effectively as they might be unless the teacher, who professes to impart them, has a knowledge of the intellectual and emotional processes of his pupils so that he can choose the most appropriate approach.)

The medical profession also is realizing that psychology has its contribution to make to the work of healing because doctors are more and more taking the view that their job is not to treat diseases but people. There is a new outlook in medicine which "restores mind to a position of at least equality with body in the diagnosis of man. Man is no longer a machine with mind as a by-product, but in the total personality mind and body join in equal partnership and both must be given their due weight[2]". It is an anachronism to think that mind and body can be separated. Man is a unity. As Professor John Macmurray has said, if the doctor is concerned to

[1] *Social Therapy,* by M. B. Hale and S. M. Hale, pp. 12ff.
[2] Dr. H. Edelston in *Body and Mind—the Problem for Medicine.*

cure his patients, the distinction between mind and body will not come into the foreground. When a patient goes to a doctor it is because he is not functioning properly as a human being, and he knows it and is more or less frightened and anxious about it. "So he goes to a doctor because the doctor offers, and is licensed by society to offer, such help. The point in this which seems to me to be of prime importance is that a patient will not consult a doctor unless he is anxious, and, therefore, every case that a doctor deals with is a case of anxiety. Whatever else a doctor is doing, he is always trying to cure anxiety and the anxiety is always the patient's anxiety about himself[3]". For a long time psychology had next to no place in the training of the medical student. As the new outlook gains ground in medicine it will be given increasing prominence, and the day is approaching when every doctor will be trained to deal not only with diseases but with patients.

The time will surely come when theological students are trained not only in theoretical knowledge about sin but will be equipped to deal with *people* who are sinful or—perhaps more often—mentally or emotionally sick. It would seem that in this sphere also Americans were before us in realizing the value of the psychiatric approach. In a book published in 1944 we read: "Twenty years ago Rev. Anton Boisen began to train theological student-internes in the Worcester State Hospital. There, in close contact for several months with mentally sick patients, he taught his students to look upon "Sin" as a relative term; demonstrated to them how human misbehaviour is determined by personality defects and disorders. Five hundred men thus trained at Worcester, Elgin and elsewhere are now dealing with human beings upon the principle that Evil of and by itself is a rather useless abstraction, and that the individual sinner is a man or woman concerning whom we need to know much more than the mere fact that he has done something wrong[4]".

We do not, of course, suggest that a minister can be sent out from a theological college in his middle twenties competent to deal with any kind of personal problem that may turn up. Such competence is the product of three factors: (1) a native flair, (2) such help as science can give, and (3) experience. The first he takes with him to college; the second he can begin to acquire there; the third can come only with the passing years. The value of some training in psychology in student days is not that it can by itself give insight into human nature, but that it will guide observation and render the building-up of experience more systematic and less haphazard than it would otherwise be. At least it can teach us what to look for.

[3] *A Philosopher looks at Psychotherapy* in Individual Psychology Medical Pamphlets, No. 20, pp. 12f.

[4] Charles F. Read, M.D. (Superintendent, Elgin State Hospital), in an essay entitled *The Law, The Prophets and Mental Medicine* contained in *A Dynamic Era of Court Psychiatry, 1914-1944.*

No branch of the Christian Church in this country has realized what an immense contribution modern psychology could make to pastoral work. The Roman Catholic Church has always given a more thorough training in moral theology than any Protestant denomination, but its application of new psychological knowledge to personal problems is, and always must be, hampered by two factors. The first is its conception of sin. "The forensic view of sin is the basis of all Roman Catholic Moral Theology. . . . This emphasis upon the forensic conception of sin in Roman Catholic Moral Theology has had unfortunate results. The priest is looked upon almost exclusively as a judge, ministering justice in a tribunal, and the Sacrament of Penance is, therefore, in danger of being regarded as a legal transaction. Other aspects of the priest's office in regard to individuals are obscured[5]". The other obstacle is the authoritarian character of the Roman Church. Whatever does not fit in precisely with its traditional theology can be rejected out of hand; it is, indeed, hardly worth consideration. Thus W. P. Witcutt writes: "Freud and Adler stand to Jung in the same relation as the pre-Socratic philosophy stood to Socrates, theirs are the partial and one-sided theories absorbed and explained by the master's synthesis. That is to our advantage, because the theories of Freud and Adler were incompatible with Catholic teaching, whereas that of Jung may be with profit studied and in part absorbed by Catholic philosophy. To attempt to discern how much may be absorbed is the purpose of this study. I submit, naturally, my conclusions to the authority of the Church, bearing in mind that

> None sooner ravished from the right creed
> Than cunning clerks that con most books.

For this reason, that the theories of Freud and Adler are incompatible with Catholic teaching, and also because their system will to all appearances soon be superseded by that of Jung, it is not profitable to spend too much time considering them[6]". We should notice, however, that, in spite of this avowal of the closed mind to all that cannot be forced into the mould of Catholic theology, the writer states quite definitely the intention of his Church to take Jung seriously.

Not many Anglicans would claim that their clergy are adequately trained in the art of dealing with personal problems. The four authors of *An Introduction to Pastoral Theology,* quoted a moment ago, can certainly speak with authority, and in their preface they sum up the position thus: "Pastoral theology has been a recognized element in the studies preparatory to ordination; but it has been mainly concerned with such matters as parochial visitation, preach-

[5] *An Introduction to Pastoral Theology,* by Balmforth, Dewar, Hudson and Sara, p. 64.

[6] *Catholic Thought and Modern Psychology,* p. 5. The book is, of course, officially approved by the Roman Catholic Church.

ing, and the public ministrations of the clergy in church, and to groups of persons in classes, clubs and the like. The pastor's ministrations to the individual, his exercise of the duties of the spiritual physician, have been left too much to the light of nature and common sense: qualifications admirable in themselves and always necessary, but inadequate for the delicate work of the physician of the soul[7]".

Of the Free Church theological colleges we can speak with more inside knowledge, and we are convinced that, with one or two possible exceptions, the teaching of psychology given in them is not such as will put the student in the way of acquiring the knowledge and experience which will make him competent to unravel the mental and emotional tangles of those who will have every right to look to him for help.

We believe, then, that the minister's training should fit him to accept the responsibility and privilege of caring for the *whole* personality. His concern is with body, mind and spirit, for personality is an indivisible unity of the three. The "cure of souls" must not be interpreted in too abstract and spiritual a sense, for the pastor's task is to care for the health and proper functioning of the whole man. When the body falls ill of itself he will, of course, need the help of the physician or surgeon, but his conception of health is wider than that with which they work. He must aim at producing a personality well and happily adjusted to itself, to others and to God, and one which, at every stage of life, can stand up to the demands made upon it.

How often a minister shakes hands and asks almost automatically, "How are you?" or says, without giving a moment's thought as to what he means—or ought to mean—"I hope you are well". What he actually means is, "I hope you are not troubled by a cold, measles, tennis elbow, housemaid's knee, or any of the other complaints listed in *The Home Doctor*". Sometimes he is assured that his hope is ill-founded and that he is looking upon a martyr to half the ailments in the catalogue. More often he receives the simple answer, "Yes, I am quite well, thank you". Of course, that may be literally true, but sometimes it means, "I am not sickening for the 'flu if that's what you are asking, so I suppose I *am* well. But I wish I could open out and tell you all about my fears and anxieties, my crippling inferiority, the feeling of guilt which haunts me, my sense of futility, my failure to make a job of my marriage, my irritation with the children. . . . I wish I had the courage to tell you all about the things that are spoiling my life, fraying my nerves and making me so everlastingly tired. I might be able to do it if I thought you would understand and could help me. But I am not sure. You might tell me to buck up, or to pull myself together or

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

just to pray about it. That would do me about as much good as the bottle of medicine given me by that doctor who said I only needed a tonic. He didn't understand either".

A minister, to whom people do not come to unburden themselves, ought to read these unspoken thoughts in the minds of many who assure him they are "quite well". He should be conscious of a wistful, searching look in their eyes when they answer his polite enquiry as to their health and well-being. And it ought to cause him some painful heart-searchings, for he must not take refuge in any form of escapism. He dare not say, "Oh, I am a scholar. My interests are academic and I suppose my people realize I am not the sort of fellow to deal with their personal problems, so they don't bother me with them". Of course, the Church needs men with a passion for scholarship just as medicine needs its pure scientists. But the scientist, who is primarily interested in academic research and theories, would be a dismal failure if he were set down in some town or village as a general practitioner, where the first qualification for his job would be an interest in *people*. Such a scientist would find his proper niche in a laboratory where he could spend his days juggling with theories and handling *things*. Similarly the minister who is (or thinks he is) of a purely academic turn of mind should never allow himself to take charge of a Church, for thereby he assumes the pastoral office of "the cure of souls", and his unfortunate people may justly feel themselves defrauded if he is uninterested in their personal problems or incompetent to help them. Such a man would find his proper sphere—and it might be a very valuable one—in a "theological laboratory[8]". Nor must a man excuse his pastoral deficiencies on the ground that he is a good organizer and can make a success of his Church as "a going concern". Again, there are no doubt spheres of Christian service in which his special gifts would be invaluable, but he is rather a misfit in the ordinary ministry. Most misguided of all is the plea: "I am a preacher. I am no good as a pastor, and I am not interested in that side of things". The statement is self-contradictory. The man who makes it (or who thinks it but is too discreet to utter it!) probably means: "I am a born preacher and my sole concern is to cultivate that gift". There is no such thing as a "born preacher". A man may perhaps be a born orator in the sense that he is endowed by nature with a good voice, a fine presence, aptitude in the use of language, poetic feeling and so on, but a spinner of words and a weaver of charms is not a preacher. He may be able to hold a congregation spellbound, and still not be a preacher. For a preacher

[8] We would add that the theological colleges are not simply laboratories, and those who are scholars, and only scholars, are not the sort of men who should be on the teaching staff. For the few men of outstanding ability, whose gifts are entirely academic, there might be a number of research fellowships, involving a minimum of teaching, attached to the colleges.

is one who speaks directly to the deep needs of men. He brings to bear upon their needs the power and grace of God of which he has known something—though he is humiliated to realize how little—in his own experience. And how can he speak directly to the needs of men unless he has discovered them by first-hand contact? Books may help him, but, if his knowledge has been acquired only in the study, his preaching will have an artificial ring about it which those wrestling with their own personal problems will not fail to detect. Dr. John Kelman used to say that he could not preach on less than a thousand visits a year. Most ministers, cumbered about with a multitude of jobs, many of which do not properly belong to their ministerial office at all, will regard Kelman's ideal as a pious aspiration in their own cases, but they should lay firm hold on the truth he is stating—that preaching and pastoral work are inseparably bound up together.

Now, if people do not bring their personal problems to a minister, his first question should be: "What is wrong with my preaching?"

In the ordinary course of his ministry a man will deal with an enormous variety of subjects and will preach many different types of sermons. Some will have little immediate bearing on the personal problems of the individuals who make up his congregation, but he will not be doing his work as a preacher unless, after most of his sermons, somebody says to himself: "Here is a man interested in human problems, who seems to know what goes on in people's minds. He might be able to help *me*". If he is really on the spot one of his hearers will often say: "He can't really know about me, but he might have preached that sermon specially for me".

We are not suggesting that ministers should "preach psychology". There is a sense in which psychology, like politics, is out of place in the pulpit. The pulpit is misused when it is turned into a platform for political propaganda, but it is also true that politics cannot be kept out of the pulpit because it is inseparable from human life and well-being. A preacher should no more "talk psychology" than he should "talk politics" in the pulpit. It is no place for the discussion of psychological theories or for dissertations on Freud, Jung or Adler, but psychology can no more be kept out of the pulpit than politics can and for the same reason—because it is the very stuff of life. A preacher must not deliver lectures on psychology in place of sermons, and he must shun psychological jargon like the plague, but he must talk about the things people are really up against in their daily lives. Then, of course, he will be applying psychology, and the more he knows of it the less he is likely to fall into the trap of "talking psychology" or of employing technical terms which he, perhaps, has only half digested and which his congregation cannot stomach at all.

Personal problems cannot, as a rule, be adequately dealt with

in sermons, and preaching is, in this respect, only a way of preparing the ground. A preacher may try to show how religion can help people to deal with anxiety or a feeling of inferiority, but, in order to clear up these troubles in any individual, who is really suffering from them, it will probably be necessary to get down to their causes, and that may occupy many hours of patient investigation in the study or the vestry. In general a preacher cannot hope to do more than make a little clearer to the sufferer the nature of his trouble and convince him that he need not stay as he is because there are resources available to him whereby he can be more than a conqueror.

In this kind of preaching it is not only knowledge which counts. The preacher's manner and style of delivery are of vital importance. With the technique of preaching in general we are not here concerned. Perhaps some types of sermon can be read or declaimed, but if a preacher is to be able to speak effectively about personal problems he must be able to do so in a conversational way. That means he must be without any "parsonic" taint in manner or voice, and he must be free of his manuscript so that he can look into the faces of his congregation. The eyes play a much greater part than many preachers realize in establishing the personal relationship between them and their congregations. It may be advisable to follow a manuscript closely when we are involved in a difficult argument which has to be put over clearly. On that point every man must decide for himself by what method he can be most effective. But sermons on personal problems lose a great deal by being read unless, of course, they are read with such consummate skill as to produce the impression that the preacher is entirely free and is speaking straight out of his heart and mind as man to man. The listener, who is feeling that he would like to consult the preacher about his difficulties, tries to imagine what it would be like to talk to him in the privacy of his study, and anything in his method or style of preaching which tends to make him seem impersonal or remote is a positive hindrance. The preacher who makes a listener with a troubled mind want to talk to him is he who can induce the individual to feel, even in the midst of a crowd, that the man in the pulpit is having a conversation with him personally.

We are convinced, then, that if a minister has an understanding of personal problems and can talk about them in the pulpit in a simple, direct, human way, people will come to him. Indeed, he will probably find that more are coming than he can deal with adequately if he is busy in other directions, and he may have to ask himself whether he ought not to drop some other activities of less value in order to make time for this personal ministry. There are still so few in the ministry (or outside) competent to deal with emotional and moral disturbances that a patient who has received

real help is not slow to tell others, and soon the minister, who has something to give, will find himself sought out by people who are nothing to do with his or any other Church. Possibly they will come to hear him preach to see for themselves whether he is likely to be able to help them. It may happen, of course, that he will be preaching a type of sermon which will not enable them to judge, but if, within two or three weeks, a minister has not shown that he understands and can deal with personal problems there is a real deficiency in his preaching no matter how adequately he may discourse on political, social or theological questions. When "outsiders" come to him he must be careful not to give the impression that he wants to attach them to his Church. He will not be able to help them if they have the faintest suspicion that there is an ulterior motive in the interest he shows. If they feel that he is concerned with them for their own sakes, and is quite disinterested, some of them will probably sooner or later associate themselves with his Church, but that will be because they have come to see for themselves, as a result of their experience with him, that they need what a Christian fellowship can give.

It is not, however, only in his preaching that the minister's work prepares the way for this more intimate personal dealing with troubled minds and maladjusted personalities. If he is observant he will find opportunities of helpfulness as he enters the homes of his people in the ordinary course of his pastoral visitation. If he is trusted he may be able to offer help in cases where it would not be sought. He must beware of giving the impression that he is a busybody who runs around poking his nose into other people's business and wanting to put everybody right, yet he must have the courage to speak when insight reveals a real need. In this matter the man who exercises a long ministry in the same place has a great advantage. He watches the children he has baptized grow into men and women with homes of their own, and, like the old type of family doctor, he becomes the natural friend and confidant of his people. Such a man has unique opportunities of helpfulness, but fortunately a man with any gift for friendship can win the confidence of many of his people during a pastorate of reasonable length. He must be patient and not try to force the pace, but when he has succeeded he will be able to detect strains and tensions which are the potential causes of trouble, and by helping to adjust them in the early stages he may prevent the development of a severe neurosis. People do not, as a rule, seek the help of a psychotherapist until they are actually ill. His function is mainly curative, but the minister has opportunities for preventive work. He may be able to see that a marriage is going awry in the very early days, and he will have a chance to avert the chronic antipathy between husband and wife which would most likely prove incurable twenty

years later. He may observe the anxiety which is beginning to haunt the mind of a child and he can try to open the eyes of the parents to what is happening so that they may learn how to give the child the security without which years of frustration and misery lie ahead. By timely aid he may be able to save the overwrought business man in his congregation from a threatened breakdown, or pilot him through the difficult years of his "change of life", when his emotional and moral stability may be assailed by sudden and unexpected temptations, which few men seem to know about and fewer still to understand. As he observes how people behave in the social and spiritual fellowship of his Church he will spot those who are not well adjusted to living with others, who preserve infantile attitudes or who are held back by fears. He will look with sympathy upon those whose lives are narrow and inhibited, whose personalities are warped and stunted, and who have never entered into that more abundant life which Christ came to give, and he will help them to find fulfilment.

But what minister, one may despairingly ask, will ever have the time to deal with such a wide variety of human needs, even if he has the desire and the ability? Plainly the answer is that none will. We are simply trying to point out the tremendous opportunity which lies before any pastor if he has gained the confidence of his people and will equip himself with the requisite knowledge and skill. If the Church is adequately to fulfil its mission of healing, a considerable number of men with special aptitude should be trained and set aside for the work. These would be specialists capable of dealing with more difficult cases, and one of them should be attached to a central Church or to a group of Churches so that he could exercise his specific ministry on behalf of the whole community. But there is a personal ministry within the scope of the ordinary parson—the "general practitioner" of the ministry—much greater than most of us have ever realized, and it is high time our equipment for our life's work included at least as much modern psychological knowledge as, for example, the decently trained social worker has at his disposal. A mere smattering of psychology is worse than useless. We must be prepared for hard study and mental discipline. We must seek a knowledge of ourselves which may prove to be a painful disillusionment, and a deeper knowledge and experience of spiritual resources without which our work will be shallow and ineffective.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

LIFE AND RELIGION IN SHETLAND

By W. Graham.

Everyone remembers how, after the outbreak of war in September, 1939, Hitler's bombers were sent almost daily not to our cities and towns as we had expected, but to the Shetland Islands.

There are a hundred islands in the Shetland group, though twenty only are inhabited, and the largest—the Mainland as it is known locally—extends about fifty-four miles from north to south. This shows how misleading most maps of the British Isles are so far as Shetland is concerned. The map-makers content themselves with a few dots scattered at random in the north-east corner.

Lerwick, the County capital, is situated on the Mainland. Rising steeply on a hill and commanding a view of one of the finest natural harbours in Britain, Lerwick is a town of strange contrasts. The streets and lanes are paved and narrow, while here and there at intervals houses can be seen jutting right into the sea.

For all its old-world and Venice-like appearance, however, the town is thoroughly modern, and possesses all the amenities found in any town of its size around our coasts. There are first-class hotels, ample facilities for various forms of sport and provision, too, for the visitor who wishes to tour the country districts and outlying islands.

It is here, indeed, rather than in the town that one comes across the real Shetland that casts its own peculiar spell over the heart and lures the traveller back again year after year.

The roads leading out from the town wind, like so many brown ribbons, among the hills and valleys or skirt the sea-shore while here and there, at intervals, can be seen the whitewashed cottage homes of the islanders.

Shetland folk live partly by farming on a small scale and partly by the production of the beautiful hosiery for which they are famed the world over. The wool of the native island sheep is peculiarly soft and warm, and the many-coloured garments that seem to grow out of the knitting-needles find a ready sale in home and foreign markets.

All the islanders speak English although with a distinct Norse accent, and the same Norse element is seen in the place-names and customs and traditions, for until 1469 Shetland was in the possession of Norway, and the people to this day are proud of their ancient lineage.

As is perhaps to be expected of an island people, the men-folk have nearly all at one time or another sailed the world over. Observant by nature and intensely sociable in disposition, their travels have given them a comprehensive knowledge of men and affairs beyond anything to be found in textbooks. It is said indeed of the Shetlander that he has been in more countries throughout the world than parishes in his native islands.

Many sons of the islands have risen to positions of eminence in varied walks of life—Sir William Watson Cheyne, a past President of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of England, Sir Robert Stout, a one-time Prime Minister of New Zealand, and Arthur Anderson, a founder of the P. & O. Steamship Company, to name only a few.

In the realm of religion, we come to something in the Shetlander's life that is very real to him—something too that is seldom seen in the south in the rush and stress of modern days, for the Church is undoubtedly the centre of his world.

Every denomination familiar in the south is represented in the island group, and all bear a striking tribute to the faith and loyalty of their congregations.

Living as they do in widely scattered communities and often miles from the nearest place of worship, church attendance calls for much of the spirit of sacrifice. A man may live three or four miles from church. If he attends twice each Sunday, that means he has to walk anything from twelve to sixteen miles.

It isn't like a city where, if the weather is bad, one can board a tram or bus. There is nothing for it in Shetland but the wide expanses of hill and moor and the storm-swept island roads.

Every evening of the week in winter is fully occupied in meeting the spiritual needs of the people. Those who live too far away to attend church must be provided for, and in their case, mid-week services are held either in one of the island school-rooms or in the homes of the people.

These mid-week Cottage Meetings are very simple yet, in their simplicity, there is a dignity not to be surpassed in any solemn cathedral service. This is no cold and formal worship but a worship living and warm that has come of age-old experiences of God's goodness and love.

The waiting audience, assembled in the small, cosy kitchen with its bright peat fire, is representative in every sense of the word—the men-folk who have sailed the oceans of the world, the island teacher (often a university graduate), a few young fellows home on army or navy leave, and possibly the local doctor as well. Then, too, there are the hard-working women whose generous gifts of hosiery have raised hundreds of pounds annually for Church funds.

A few hymns are sung—nearly always from Sankey's Hymnary—then a prayer, and then the minister addresses his people. He knows them all—knows their particular needs and trials—knows all their joys and sorrows, their hopes and fears.

Above everything, he knows what they have come for—those people, varied in their callings but united in their seeking—and he begins to speak to them of the things that really matter. As he speaks with conviction from the depths of his own personal experience, the minister is glad in the privilege that is his of bringing to the anxious or troubled hearts of his hearers the answering comfort of the Gospel.

Such, then, is a brief review of life in the islands that Hitler chose for his first British target. In common with us all, Shetlanders have had to make many a costly sacrifice that righteousness might again prevail amongst men. But in their darkest hours one was always conscious of the strength that comes through faith, and Isaiah's words rang with a strange new power—"The isles also shall wait upon Him".

WORTH NOTING

Bishop Yu-Pim, often called the Mercier of China, and at the present moment member of most of the committees dedicated to relief work in China, . . . wrote in *The Sign* of April, 1944:

> I love my country too much to see it going the way of so many other nations, caught up in the mad quest for material comfort. Material reconstruction there must be, but unless it be accompanied by a spiritual reconstruction, China is doomed to failure. She will have the body without the soul. She will have the sharpened sword, but know not how to use it. An opportunity is at hand that will not be repeated. Therefore I issue a call to a spiritual crusade. I wish to recruit thousands of men and women who are interested in a career-vocation, to call to China engineers, doctors, professors, nurses, social service workers, journalists, to help to rebuild this awakened nation. But this call is not to those who wish only to be engineers or doctors in China. This is a call for apostles, a vocation only for people with character. I want men and women who, while engaging in their professional careers, will bring something more to China, who will radiate Christianity, who will show what it means to live by Christian principles. Indeed, this latter element is essential. Unless our career men and women possess a deep spiritual life—they are useless.
>
> H. VAN STRAELEN, *A Missionary in the War Net.*

CORRESPONDENCE

FROM SIR ERNEST GRAHAM-LITTLE, M.D., F.R.C.P., M.P.

The Editor, CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY

SIR,—In your issue of October, you wrote, after some uncomplimentary remarks about the medical profession, "The disparity between the income of the doctor and of the teacher (even under the Burnham scales) gives one furiously to think". You are clearly unaware of the different circumstances of preparation for these two professions. A little more accurate knowledge may induce you to "think again". In the present position of the Education Act, 1944, new recruits will be required to implement the Act in numbers which have been estimated as 100,000. The vast majority of these recruits will receive the status of "qualified teachers" in the National Schools after one year's training in improvised "Colleges" and without being required to pass any examination. Expenses of maintenance and tuition during the period of training are to be defrayed by the "State".

Under the scheme for "socialized medicine" which you so warmly approve, the number of doctors required will be at least three times as many as are now available. The conditions offered to these new recruits have so far evoked protest from the large majority of the profession, and doctors, I submit, cannot be "improvised" on the lines now adopted for teachers. But the point I wish to make is, that the training for doctors who intend to be general practitioners, occupies a minimum period of six years, and for specialists ten years, the training to achieve qualified status being tested by a series of searching examinations, the standard of which is fixed by a statutory body, the General Medical Council. The expenses of this preparation are born wholly by the aspirant and an approximate sum would be from £1,500-£2,500. Do you really think that the "disparity" which you castigate is unjustified?

I am, etc.,

E. GRAHAM-LITTLE.

House of Commons, 14th November, 1945.

[We cannot agree that the paragraph, of which Sir E. Graham-Little complains, contains any "uncomplimentary remarks about the medical profession", which we hold in high esteem. Some of the best men we know belong to that profession, and the best doctors exercise an influence for good greater perhaps than that of men in any other calling. We do not think that Sir Ernest meets our argument by his reference to the 100,000 "improvised" teachers, who will be required by the Education Act of 1944. (It may be remarked that many of the candidates, who survive the drastic initial weeding-out and who have real aptitude and a sense of vocation, will make excellent teachers after a year's intensive college training and the two years of supervision which follow. The whole plan is, in any case, a temporary expedient designed to meet an emergency). Much more to the point would be a comparison between the position of the average teacher, say an assistant in a Grammar School, and the average general practitioner. When every allowance has been made for the cost of training, Sir Ernest will find a disparity difficult for him to justify.—EDITOR.]

CURRENT LITERATURE

(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated)

The Devil and God. By WILLIAM ROBINSON, M.A., B.Sc., D.D. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

Courage, mes enfants. Le diable est mort. But is he? Our generation is not so sure. The hypothesis of a personal power of evil no longer appears as crudely unscientific as it did to our immediate predecessors. There is no *a priori* irrationality in supposing the existence of created beings of higher intelligence and greater power than man, some of whom may be evil. How is the belief in the Devil reconcilable with Christian monotheism? What reasons can be given in support of the belief, and within what limits does the Gospel confine it? These are some of the questions Principal Robinson attempts to answer. Although he disclaims a thoroughgoing discussion of the problem of cosmic evil, this dark mystery is the inevitable background of his book. The most valuable chapter deals with the biblical material, and shows how insignificant is the *rôle* of Satan in the Old Testament compared with the part he plays, under various *aliases,* in the New. Pointing out that none of the ecumenical creeds requires belief in the existence of the Devil, the author makes it clear that Christ's victory over the principalities and powers of evil is integral to the Gospel, and remains when we have dismissed the details of hellenistic demonology and the grotesque caricature of the "ransom" theory of the Atonement that disfigured patristic thought on that subject. The Gospel, we are reminded, deals with evil not as a problem to be solved, but as an enemy to be overcome. As for the problem, dualistic solutions are ruled out; the Devil is not a cosmic power coeternal with God, but our sinful fellow-creature. Nor can we shift upon the Devil's shoulders the responsibility for our sin. This little book, written not for specialists but for the ordinary reader, is a suggestive and balanced treatment of a theme which, if not itself central to our faith, is not without bearing upon the things that are. H. F. LOVELL COCKS.

Humanism and Human Dignity. Yale Studies in Religion No. 13. By LUTHER WINGFIELD STALNAKER. Yale & Oxford Presses. 6s. 6d.

Short as it is, a tract of only 58 pages, this study contains a close and thorough examination of the philosophies of Bradley, Bosanquet, and Royce. The analysis raises some of the deepest questions in philosophy and theology. The angle from which the Absolute Idealism of the three philosophers is surveyed is that of the Humanism of James and Schiller. Dr. Stalnaker accepts the Humanist point of view as without question the right position in all metaphysical discussions.

The argument takes place under three heads: (1) Time; (2) Evil; (3) Freedom. In each case the Absolutist view is stated: it is then criticized with the aim of showing that it is inconsistent with itself, and cannot be developed without implying the Humanist doctrine opposed to it.

The following is a summary of the statements and accompanying criticisms.

(1) The three philosophers speak of their Absolute as *timeless.* Yet it is viewed by them as a synthetic unity in which contradictions are reconciled. But such reconciliation of antitheses in a synthesis is unthinkable except as a process in time. Thus the Absolute implies the time-series, the reality of which is a first principle of Humanism.

(2) The Absolute is said to be *beyond good and evil.* It is maintained that evil is absorbed into a whole in which it is overcome by good. Yet it is not supposed that evil altogether disappears: it remains as that which is overcome. In other words, the reality of evil is granted, which is a second principle of Humanism.

(3) The Absolute is stated to be completely *determinate,* inasmuch as there is nothing outside itself which can alter it. Yet its determination can only be described in terms of teleology; and teleology implies moral freedom, which is a third principle of Humanism.

Dr. Stalnaker therefore desires to set in place of the timeless, transcendent, and determinate Absolute a "loose-jointed" system of contending wills, out of whose contention an ideal of action develops, sponsored by a guiding Will which is the will of God. Such is the argument and such the conclusion of this lucidly written treatise.

It must be observed, however, that what Dr. Stalnaker means by God is a Finite Being, and the question at once arises whether a Finite Being, however exalted, can fitly be named God. The answer must be in the negative. Dr. Stalnaker is certainly in line with much modern theology which is fond of talking about the "enrichment" of God's experience through the reaction of other wills upon His. But God cannot be enriched, since there can be no increase of the Infinite.

We must conclude, then, that the attempt to escape from the perils of Absolute Idealism by the adoption of Humanism is simply an avoidance of Scylla in order to run into Charybdis. Indeed, of the two types of philosophy, Absolute Idealism stands nearer to a genuine Theism, for which the Infinity and Immutability of God is a first principle. To combine with such a Theism a proper respect for moral freedom is no doubt difficult; but, after all, St. Thomas Aquinas has managed to do it. Consequently, the *philosophia perennis* is a better support for Christian theology than the Humanism of Dr. Stalnaker.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Religious Experience. By C. C. J. WEBB. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

" . . . this expression, *Religious Experience,* . . . has fallen into disrepute . . . ": in this lecture Dr. Webb seeks to rescue it from that disrepute. He analyzes "the offence which it gives" as twofold: first, the noun has a subjective flavour as over against the divine revelation; and secondly, the adjective suggests comprehensivensss as over against the historical distinctiveness of Christianity. He then urges that the first antithesis is unreal, since by calling anything "an experience . . . we distinguish it from ourselves and describe it as *happening* to us"; and urges "the existence of a genuine religious experience" of a universal character and free from the abnormalities to which William James gave prominence, as in no way incompatible with the Christian experience in which, in fact, it culminates. Dr. Webb dissents strongly from current attempts "to withdraw alogether dogmas based upon historical fact from the scrutiny and criticism of reason". He also pleads for courage to face the fact that there is "infallibility nowhere", neither in Church nor in Bible, and that our best criterion is given us through God's Holy Spirit "enlightening the mind, impelling to charity, but always . . . imparting to us this treasure in earthen vessels". Free Churchmen will welcome this contribution from an eminent Anglican layman. The volume is a *Festgabe* for Dr. Webb's eightieth birthday, and includes a portrait and bibliography as well as a brief memoir by his successor, Professor L. W. Grensted.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Peace that was Left. By EMILE CAMMAERTS. Cresset Press. 6s.

All who know M. Emile Cammaerts are aware of his fine Christian spirit; he has fought a good fight and has kept the faith, and this book is a register of that faith which the author has put on record for the benefit and guidance of "those young Christians" who have come through the war and found only disappointment and disillusionment. "I wish to help them," says M. Cammaerts, "to master their disappointment and to work for a new hope" which he describes as "the hope of peace". "An inadequate peace may yield good results if it is applied in the right spirit; an adequate peace will not bear fruit if it is applied in the wrong spirit"; but "peace cannot be achieved through the fear of war, it can only come through the fear and love of God". So the author deals in successive chapters with "The Peace of God", "The Peacemakers", "The Gospel of Peace", "The Price of Peace", and other aspects of the subject.

This being said, the book is nevertheless somewhat puzzling. Is it a devotional manual or a political treatise? Its emphasis suggests the former, but the author discusses the politics of peace from time to time and the process gives the impression of a misfit. "There are two conflicts," he says, "the conflict between men because they ignore or reject the peace of God; and the conflict between Christians and a world which despises or hates them because they do not belong to it". But these two conflicts become confused, and the reader is not always quite sure which is being dealt with at any given moment. No one will question the author's contention that the man who is at peace with God will endeavour to bring peace to the world; but here again there seems to be confusion. For "war should mean to him (the Christian peacemaker) . . . any kind of hostility or indifference which breaks the divine law of love", a law which the Christian is pledged to observe; yet a war "waged in self-defence or in defence of the weak against the strong" apparently fall within the compass of this divine law! Comments by the author's daughter appear throughout the book, and at this point she remarks, "You raise the whole question of pacifism here"; and later on she poses "the problem of what a Christian has to do with himself before he can force himself to kill". But whenever M. Cammaerts faces the pacifist issue, he passes by on the other side and "the young Christian" is left without the "benefit and guidance" which is promised in the opening pages of the book. This really will not do; indeed the failure to grapple with this central problem gives an unconvincing tone to the reiterated plea for fidelity at any cost to "the divine law of love". Either the processes of war square with a Christian reaction to the world's evil or they do not, and no treatment of the problem of "Peacemaking" is adequate which ignores the question. The "Gospel of Peace" which the book commends to "the young Christian" is not Good-News but merely an echo of worldly-wisdom if it commends war "waged in self-defence or in defence of the weak against the strong". How then does the Gospel differ from the counsels of statesmanship? This cardinal omission to relate the Gospel to the methods (as distinct from the aims) of a "just war" seems to the present reviewer to vitiate what would otherwise be a soul-searching call to "surrender to the will of God and to follow the way through the door broken open by the Cross, even to the bitter end which may be the Cross itself".

The book contains many judgments upon the politics in vogue between the two world-wars, and these invariably bespeak a genuine Christian insight. The author's once-Roman, now-Anglican affiliations appear in his acceptance of baptismal regeneration and a mild sacerdotalism; but they are not essential to his theme and there is nothing here to offend the most perfervid Evangelical. Indeed, the book from start to finish is an evangelical appeal; and if its failure to apply the Evangel to "the problem of what a

Christian has to do with himself before he can force himself to kill" be overlooked, the reading of it will undoubtedly bring "the young Christian" face to face with fundamental spiritual issues. And in this at least M. Cammaerts is right; it is only as we face these issues in Christ's name that "the Peace of God" will find lodgment in a war-torn world.

LEYTON RICHARDS.

Imperial Commonwealth. By LORD ELTON. Collins. 21s.
Religion in America. By WILLARD L. SPERRY. Cambridge Press. 10s. 6d.

We always desire to write our review of a book before reading other opinions. With Lord Elton's big volume we were unfortunate, for before opening it we had seen both Sir Ernest Barker's description of the author as a "just and convincing historian" who had written "a full and growing narrative" and the *New Statesman's* review in which he was called "a rhapsodist of Empire" and his book "disdainful". The truth, we suspect, lies somewhere between these verdicts, but nearer to Sir Ernest Barker's. Even though it be true that Lord Elton's style sometimes becomes dithyrambic, it is welcome because it carries the reader along; even though sometimes his pages become a panegyric and unhappy features are skipped—there are two brief mentions of Eire—it is good, after so much criticism of the British Commonwealth, to find a historian ready to praise its contributions to civilization. The British Empire, Lord Elton maintains, grew, while other Empires were manufactured, and often

> where nothing would have been easier than to take much, Authority took little, and would have preferred to take nothing. Where it moved, it moved reluctantly and under the impulse of some distant representative whose arguments it was unable to resist, or whose action it could not control.

Apart from some unfortunate paragraphs about Amritsar, Lord Elton is weakest where his subject in any way touches religion. His references to the Pilgrim Fathers do not inspire confidence, and often unfamiliarity is revealed by such descriptions as that of Richard Price as a "nonconformist clergyman". Quoting Benjamin Franklin's words in 1773, "The Dissenters are all for us", Lord Elton comments:

> Franklin may have been a trifle optimistic. The Dissenters were not in fact all for the Americans: John Wesley himself argued the orthodox British view in a series of eloquent tracts.

How horrified John Wesley would have been to hear himself called a Dissenter. In 1773, we suspect, the title was still limited to those belonging to the old Dissent—Baptist, Independent, and Presbyterian.

It looks as if the book has been written too hastily: there is a good deal of repetition, it would have benefited by shortening. Lord Elton does not seem able to make up his mind whether the London Missionary Society was founded in 1794 or 1795, or how Kuruman is spelt. More important is that there is no mention of William Carey.

All this detracts but little from the value of a very timely piece of work, which we hope will be read widely in the United States as well as throughout the Commonwealth.

We put Dean Sperry's admirable book—the first in a series on American Life and Institutions—with Lord Elton's because in his concluding paragraphs the author writes as if he has swallowed hook, line, and sinker all the propaganda about "British Imperialism". At a time when American —and Russian—Imperialism is spreading itself like the green bay tree (in-

evitably so, after Pearl Harbour and the expansion of American resources) and British Imperialism gave an expiring squeak in a sentence of Mr. Churchill's, it is strange to find one who knows Britain so well writing as if Britain had not changed since he came to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar forty years ago. It would do Dean Sperry good to read Lord Elton. And it would certainly do Lord Elton good—and all of us—to read Dean Sperry's timely, informative, and suggestive book.

Religion in America, with its 256 denominations, its immense variety of race, colour, background, education, presents an almost impossible subject to the writer. But Dr. Sperry has not only managed to convey information about religious life in America's past and present: he has done it in a form so fascinating that it is difficult to put the book down, while the reader becomes increasingly aware that he will often have to turn to its pages, and not least the valuable appendixes, for facts and figures.

About theology, religious education, the relation of Church and State, the denominations, the negro churches, and church union—about all these Dr. Sperry writes freshly, while his knowledge of Britain enables him to make helpful comparisons. Sometimes he is inclined to "lean over backwards" lest it be thought he is biased by his Congregationalism; especially is this so in the chapter on Catholicism, where he relies on Mr. Theodore Maynard, who, if his biography of Queen Elizabeth is typical, is scarcely to be relied upon. But we wish the volume the wide circulation it deserves. Far too little is known in Britain about American church life, and this book should do much to dispel our darkness. It makes us anticipate with eagerness the remaining volumes in the series.

ALBERT PEEL.

Dom Bernard Clements: a Portrait. By E. M. ALMEDINGEN. John Lane. 8s. 6d.

After a curacy at Friern Barnet, a chaplaincy in the Navy and a charge at Portsmouth, Fr. W. D. Clements entered the Anglican Benedictine abbey at Pershore. Five years later the community "lent" him to St. Augustine's College, Kumasi, in West Africa. After five years there he returned to England, and from 1934 to 1942, still as Dom Bernard Clements, O.S.B., he was Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street, and hailed as a great preacher throughout the country and over the wireless. Certainly, Protestants as well as Catholics were reached by the sincerity and power of his preaching. An understanding of the man is worth seeking, not only just because his manifest piety is not our own, but for its significance as a high watermark of the Oxford Movement's wash over the Church of England. Or was it? Was Dom Bernard, rather, an eccentric, a sort of modern Father Ignatius? One wonders, when one observes that his monastic vows did not interfere with his love of good sherry or his playing bridge for money. Or, again, is this combination simply another reminder that Catholicism does not demand, as Protestantism demands, the acceptance of personal and individual responsibility? For instance, "If you understand each word as you utter it", wrote Dom Bernard of worship (p. 39), "it is very wonderful and helpful, but it is not in the least necessary. What matters finally, as far as the meaning goes, is the meaning of the whole Catholic Church which is at the back of you". Again, we are told that "Priest Fr. Clements was first and last", ' widely and deeply Catholic, abhorring the very idea of anyone's personal dependence on him *qua* himself" (pp. 26f.). After this, the Protestant rejoices to read that "above all, Dom Bernard remained himself . . . the African students were allowed to observe him as he was, and the reality of the man won them over" (p. 66). It is certainly the reality of the man, and

of the Christian, which wins the reader. Yet one is conscious, uneasily, that Dom Bernard, psychologically, never grew up, but remained a boy, with a boy's sense of wonder, gaucheness and self-distrust. This the author is at pains not to conceal. What she does not remark is the connection between this and Dom Bernard's desire to give "blind obedience" (p. 90; the phrase stirs Hitlerian memories) not only to God, nor even to His Church, but to a community and its abbot. Is one not bound, also, to associate with these two things the fact that "he was successful with boys and young men, less so with women. . . . There lived but one woman in his life, and she was his mother" (p. 1). In view of this last statement, it is striking that his life should have been written by a woman, and one who writes with a delicacy, not to say preciousness, entirely feminine. Her style provides a good foil to the ruggedness of her quotations from Dom Bernard.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The gift of imaginative writing Mr. John S. Hoyland has shown in regard to India is transferred to Palestine in the time of Jesus. *These Saw Jesus* (Lutterworth Press, 5s.) contains twenty stories in which, to quote the jacket, Mr. Hoyland "fills out with local colour and imaginative detail the human story that must lie behind" the incidents and parables of the Gospels.

But—Suppose He was Right (Marshall, 2s.)—"in loving people not exploiting them; in refusing to pigeon-hole facts; in believing in people and bringing the best out of them; in going all lengths to snatch victory from defeat": thus, with many illustrations from the mission-field, the Rev. Max Warren, the General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, describes the way of love, the way of imagination, the way of faith, and the way of forgiveness.

Dr. Hugh Martin had an excellent notion in writing about seven *Great Christian Books* (S.C.M., 6s.). He has chosen Augustine's *Confession,* Samuel Rutherford's *Letters,* Brother Lawrence, the *Pilgrim's Progress,* the *Serious Call,* William Carey's *Enquiry,* and, rather unexpectedly, *The Ring and the Book.* The description of the seven books makes interesting reading, with the chapter on Bunyan outstanding.

It is well that one with the knowledge and pertinacity of Dr. R. E. D. Clark should analyse the opinions of the "rationalists". *Scientific Rationalism and the Christian Faith* (I.V.F., 2s.) deals with Dr. J. B. S. Haldane and Dr. Julian Huxley, examples of the once-born and twice-born agnostics.

The Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth's bibliography, *Unity and Religion* (Black, 12s. 6d.) will be found very useful, its 150 pp. of classified books covering a great deal of ground. It is a pity, however, that the compiler did not secure the assistance of some Free Church scholar, for the entries are very patchy: there is, *e.g.,* no mention of the "Happy Union" between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in 1691, and while the Rev. H. C. Carter's Address from the Chair of the Congregational Union appears, that of the Rev. K. L. Parry does not. There are few entries relating to Baptists and Congregationalists, and one gets the impression that while Free Church objectors to Union proposals are very silent, Anglican objectors are voluble.

Mr. H. L. Gee's books have brought comfort and help to many people, and his anthology, *Good in Everything* (Methuen, 5s.) will be no exception, even if the sentiment is sometimes a little cloying.

Philosophy—East and West (Princeton & Oxford Presses, 23s. 6d.) is a far from easy book to review. It contains ten papers read at the East-West Philosophers' Conference held at the University of Hawaii in 1939. Prof. W. E. Hocking opens with "Value of the Comparative Study of Philosophy", and Dr. C. A. Moore, who edits the volume, sums up in "Comparative Philosophies of Life." The intervening papers are Prof. G. P. Conger's "An Outline of Indian Philosophy", Prof. Chan Wing-tsit's "The Story of Chinese Philosophy", Prof. Jungiro Takakusu's "Buddhism as a Philosophy of 'Thusness' ", Prof. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuku's "An Interpretation of Zen-Experience", Prof. Shunzo Sakamaki's "Shinto: Japanese Ethnocentrism", Prof. Chan Wing-tsit's "The Spirit of Oriental Philosophy", Prof. F. S. C. Northrop's "The Complementary Emphases of Eastern Intuitive and Western Scientific Philosophy", and Prof. Conger's "Eastern and Western Metaphysics". Dr. Moore regrets the absence of contributors from India, but the papers make clear deficiencies in Western thought, and the need for it to incorporate and assimilate the teachings of Oriental philosophy.

Mr. J. C. Whitebrook, barrister-at-law, having fought with great courage against failing eyesight and the loss of most of his possessions by enemy action, has been routed by the commas which march at will over the pages of his *The Consecration of Matthew Parker* (Mowbray, 8s. 6d.), an amazing story of intrigue, forgery, theft, and of mystery. With forensic skill Mr. Whitebrook marshals the facts years of research have brought him, and proves to his own satisfaction that Parker was consecrated on 29th October, 1559, by Anthony Kitchen of Llandaff, and not in December of that year as the Lambeth Register states. Furthermore, this consecration by a Bishop who never forsook the old religion was deliberate, Elizabeth, Cecil, and Parker himself hoping that it might be instrumental in effecting reunion with Rome. It was concealed and surrounded with mystification so that the anger of the keen Protestants should not be aroused. Kitchen's part in the consecration was rewarded—in that he was left alone in his diocese ordaining ministers in the Roman succession. With all the light Mr. Whitebrook throws on the problem—and his style sometimes throws the reverse of light—he has failed to discover why Kitchen was in such favour with Henry VIII: if this should emerge it might help to explain Elizabeth's use of him and kindness to him. There is much evidence against Mr. Whitebrook's conclusions, to which he does not appear to have given sufficient consideration; but he has put the cat among the pigeons, and the detailed examination of his work by Anglican scholars may enable us in time to reach the truth about a matter which has for centuries baffled the historians.

Mr. H. H. Stroup's *The Jehovah's Witnesses* (Columbia & Oxford Presses, 16s. 6d.) is a useful and timely piece of work, though it would have been better had the leaders of the organization been willing to give the author information. So definite was their refusal that Mr. Stroup maintains they must be deemed a "secret society". First organized by C. T. Russell in 1872 (though "Judge" Rutherford claimed they were 5,000 years old), they have borne many names—Russellites, Watch Tower People, and (in Britain) International Bible Students. They claim to be "the Lord's organization", as opposed to Satan's, which includes not only "the world", but all forms of institutional religion. The organization is maintained largely by the sale of its pamphlets and publications, to which the Witnesses assiduously devote themselves ("service in the form of witnessing from door to door is the paramount duty of the followers of Christ today"); its finances are not published. The leaders—Russell, Rutherford,

and now Mr. N. H. Knott—seem to be in absolute control, and the Witnesses generally accept their teachings as recorded in pamphlets, *etc.*, without reserve. They are not pacifists, but they refuse to acknowledge obligations to any society other than their own: therefore they refuse to salute the flag or bear arms. Hence they incur unpopularity and sometimes persecution. Mr. Stroup says it is impossible to estimate their number.

Eight people have joined in making *Homage to Newman, 1845-1945* (Archbishop's House, Westminster, 2s. 6d.), and the result is some repetition of an already very familiar story. The illustrations are the most attractive part of the book. Dr. Denis Gwynn sets out to prove that, contrary to the accepted notion, Newman's

> splendid record of constructive and inspiring work as a Catholic [contrasted with] the most unhappy frustration which he suffered in the Church of England.

Despite this, he has to quote Newman's remark on receiving the Cardinalate, "The cloud is lifted from me for ever".

In *Timothy Richard* (Carey Press, 6s.) the Rev. E. W. Price Evans has re-told the story of Timothy Richard's great work in China. These graphic pages should somehow be got into the hands of young Protestants, showing as they do, the achievements of one "dedicated spirit".

Dr. H. Van Straelen, who was a Roman Catholic missionary in Japan, in *A Missionary in the War Net* (Droitwich: Hadzor Press, 3s. 3d.) describes his internment and subsequent experiences. He believes that "the final commentary on the Gospels cannot be written, until Japan, China, and India have been Christianized". See also "Worth Noting".

In reviewing *The Letters of George S. Gordon* we said that Mrs. Gordon's brief Introduction had made us wish for more. Well, here it is in *The Life of George S. Gordon* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.), which tells of a full life in the Universities of Glasgow, Oxford, Leeds, and then Oxford again, culminating in the Vice-Chancellorship. In reviewing the *Letters* we regretted that the struggle between letters and affairs which marked Gordon's life had greatly diminished the volume of writing to be expected from his pen. It is good to learn that there are words of his still to appear. Mrs. Gordon makes her husband live in these pages, and there is many a good story to delight the reader. We like the reply of the applicant being interviewed for a position under the Colonial Office: "What would you do if you were to look out of the window and see a riot?" "I should go out and quell it".

Is there any significance in the fact that a new series "Modern Christian Revolutionaries" (Clarke, 4s. 6d.) has a Roman Catholic editor, and that the first five volumes deal with two Roman Catholics (Eric Gill, by the editor, Mr. Donald Attwater himself; and G. K. Chesterton, by Mr. F. A. Lea); one Orthodox, Nicolas Berdyaev by Dr. Evgueny Lampert; one Protestant, Reinhold Niebuhr, by the Rev. D. R. Davies; and C. F. Andrews, who eludes classification, by Dr. Nicol Macnicol? None of these, it will be seen, can be called a liberal in theology, and three of them, Eric Gill, Dr. Niebuhr, and Dr. Berdyaev (some would include Chesterton) range over a wide field and are not easy to read—or to expound. The result is that the little volumes are far from light relief—and even Dr. Berdyaev's name is sometimes too much for the compositor. Of these four volumes, Mr. Davies' is the most readable, though sometimes Dr. Niebuhr must pray to be delivered from his interpreter, who once more shows unusual acquaintance with the Deity ("Providence, which has always displayed a profound ironical sense of humour"), and shows the convert's expected enthusiasm in his

regard for episcopacy. Dr. Macnicol's sketch of C. F. Andrews is marked by the skilled touch characteristic of him.

There is not much that is exciting in the life of a headmaster, but it is good to read the biography of one who succeeded so well as did Donald Gray, headmaster of Bootham from 1927 until his death in 1943 at the age of 50. Boy at Bootham, undergraduate at Glasgow and Oxford, with the F.A.U. in France and Italy, at Bootham as assistant and then as head—that is the sequence well described in Mr. Victor W. Alexander's *Donald Gray* (Friends' Book Centre, 5s. & 3s. 6d.), a well-illustrated sketch which will appeal to many besides Friends.

Mr. Derek Hudson has had to pick and choose in writing the essay *British Journalists and Newspapers* in Collins' pleasing "Britain in Pictures" series (4s. 6d.), but it is readable enough, and the illustrations, especially those in colour, are very good, though not so lovely as those in another volume in the series, a very readable one, Mr. Geoffrey Taylor's *Insect Life in Britain*. The reproductions are less effective in Capt. H. J. Paris' informing though difficult *English Water Colour Painters*, which devotes paragraphs to artists who figure largely in the present exhibition of war pictures—Paul Nash, Henry Moore, John Piper, and Graham Sutherland. In *Islands Round Britain* Mr. R. M. Lockley had a difficult task, for he had to choose between 453 islands, not counting smaller ones: we are glad he has not found the island on which we have had our eyes for many years. This series is a war-time achievement of considerable merit.

Freedom of Expression (Hutchinson: International Authors, 16s.), edited by Mr. Hermon Ould, is a symposium based on a Conference called by the London P.E.N. Club to commemorate the tercentenary of the *Areopagitica* by discussing "The Place of Spiritual and Economic Values in the Future of Mankind". The volume provides some fine confused feeding, some of the distinguished writers being obsessed by Milton, others by the terms "spiritual" and "economic", and we have addresses slight and smart, halting and heavy. Most of the contributors say what we should expect, but the papers of Mr. Herbert Read and Mr. Herbert Agar stand out. Noteworthy is an Indian essay, in which the writer says he could recite the first book of *Paradise Lost* when he was twelve, and that in Bengal in the later half of the 19th century Milton was a household word. This is surely an exaggeration, but it reminds us that ideas have no national boundaries, and ideas of freedom are as valid in India—and in Russia—as in Britain and the United States. Special mention should be made of Mr. E. M. Forster's Presidential Address. Mr. Forster says it is the first time he had acted as Chairman. If his address was as effective when spoken as it is in print, he will be in great demand.

The policy of the Vatican during the war has been strongly condemned in many quarters, as in the pages of the *Congregational Quarterly*, and a defence has long been called for. Mr. Camille M. Cianfarra's *The War and the Vatican* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.) sets out to provide such a defence, but something very different will be needed if the Pope is to secure an acquittal at the bar of Christendom. Mr. Cianfarra has for many years been the correspondent in Rome and at the Vatican of the *New York Times*—often called *The Times* in his pages, to the confusion of English readers—and his sketch is lively journalism.

> At 5.40 Monsignor Pucci ran out of the elevator.
> "The Pope is dead", he announced in a strangled voice.
> "At what time?" we all shouted.
> "5.31".

"We all shouted"—in the presence of death: that is the atmosphere in which Mr. Cianfarra worked, and we learn much of bribery of Vatican servants in order to get news, of intrusion into private places, *etc.* What we do not find is any convincing defence of the Pope's attitude: had he summoned the faithful to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty how much sooner war might have ended. A much more objective treatment is seen in Mr. M. H. H. Macartney's useful little book in the "Current Problems" series (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.), *The Rebuilding of Italy*, which not only gives chapter and verse for speeches by bishops and clergy in support of Mussolini's policy, but lists acts by the Pope which were hailed by the Fascists as signs of Papal support and statements, such as the description of the Vatican City as "almost in the centre of Rome" (after the bombing of the outskirts by American airmen), which scarcely fit the facts. In the same series is Dr. C. S. Orwin's *Problems of the Countryside*, a clear and forthright statement to which the new Parliament should give attention: sandwiched between a description of the past and a vision of the future, Dr. Orwin's account of the English countryside and its problems is as disturbing as it is readable.

Dr. Norman Maclean's *His Terrible Swift Sword* (New York: Christian Council on Palestine, 25c.) was evidently written in 1941: there is no date to Dr. Daniel A. Poling's Foreword. We wonder if the ex-Moderator of the Church of Scotland would have written in the same style today, when it has been made clear that Jews in Palestine as well as Arabs resort to violence. One can have every sympathy with the Jews, one can even be in sympathy with the Zionist movement, and yet feel that Dr. Maclean's perfervid oratory is likely to do the Zionists more harm than good. All is as black and white to Dr. Maclean, to whom A. J. Balfour was a simple believer! A Britain which refuses to give the Jews in Palestine rights as a nation, with power to admit Jews as they will, is an apostate nation. A Government which tries to be just to Arabs and Jews alike is but trying to appease 3,000 Arab bandits. Would that the problem were as simple as this book makes it: nobody, we imagine, would rejoice more than the Government of the people to whom the mandate for Palestine was entrusted.

We have already had occasion to commend Mr. F. L. Brayne's "Socrates" books, which have aided the admirable work he has done in transforming Indian villages. In *In Him Was Light* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.) he continues his propaganda, now appealing specially to Indian Christians, and showing them how the Gospel must be applied to the everyday life of their villages.

Although it contains a good deal of useful information—about the contribution of the Civil Service to the establishment of PAYE, the Civil Service press, and notably in the chapter on "The Social Significance of the Service", Mr. R. W. Rawlings' *The Civil Service and the People* (Lawrence & Wishart, 7s. 6d.) is a disappointment. Written in cumbrous style and from a definite point of view, "monopolistic capitalism" is Mr. Rawlings' *bête noire*, while generalizations abound. This sentence may serve to illustrate the writer's outlook and method:

> The growing knowledge that they are in the long run nothing but the instruments of an elaborately disguised class domination, combined with the attempt on the part of heads of state to foster the idea that they are a class apart from those classes who more directly work for the capitalist system, is making the Civil Service a breeding ground for neurosis and every kind of frustration.

There is abundant evidence in these pages that Mr. Rawlings could have given us a much better book.

It is a pleasure to find a book by a distinguished medical authority opening with the categorical statement, "Continence before and fidelity after marriage would in a very short time eliminate Venereal Disease". Dr. L. Martindale's *The Prevention of Venereal Disease* (Heinemann, 2s. 6d.) describes the disease and methods of its control and cure, and concludes that "the only real means of prevention lies in morality".

We do not know whether bird-lovers or aeroplane-lovers will get most out of Mr. Jack Parham's *Bird Flight for Bird Lovers* (Marshall, 7s. 6d.), but all those interested in flying will be fascinated by it. Illustrations and text alike show the remarkable similarity in the flight of birds and of machines.

In *The Barriers are Down* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Jack Lindsay makes "The Collapse of a Civilisation" (the years 451-455) very vivid to the reader. The narrative moves quickly as we learn how the coming of the Hun affected not only the Roman Empire, but the lives of four young men, whose characters are skilfully drawn. For all of them life is conflict—one falls a prey to lust, the second is driven on by ambition, the third finds satisfaction in activity in the world, the fourth in withdrawal from it. A successful novel, from which much can be learnt.

Mr. C. S. Lewis' *That Hideous Strength* (Lane, 9s. 6d.) is far more successful than the two parts of the trilogy which have preceded it. It is a thriller which holds the reader, while the discerning will see much more in it than that. "Who shall plan the planners?" is one of its themes, and the manner in which power corrupts planners who cease to value human personality is well brought out. Mr. Lewis, however, should not become so fascinated by Merlin and the Macrobes that he forgets his grammar (p. 317) and his spelling (p. 215). Nevertheless, we should put this book next to the *Preface to Paradise Lost* and *The Screwtape Letters* in Mr. Lewis' rapidly lengthening list of productions.

Would that Miss Jane Lane could escape from the fanaticism which disfigures both her biography, *King James the Last,* and her novels: it does not ruin them altogether, for Miss Lane can write: whether in portraying a character or in narrative she has gifts above the ordinary. But all the time the reader cannot escape the notion that her aim is Jacobite and Roman Catholic propaganda. No opportunity to sneer at, and even to slander, William of Orange is lost, and Miss Lane apparently really believes that spiritual liberty and Roman Catholicism go together. *Gin and Bitters* (Dakers, 10s. 6d.) continues the story of Michael Montague related in *England for Sale*. Michael himself is a puppet, but the brewer Vance and his daughter Maralyn are living characters, and so is the harlot Moll, who, like so many of her contemporaries, succumbed to "Madame Geneva", the gin which gives the book its title.

It is clear from *Mother Hubbard* (Gifford, 8s. 6d.) that Mr. W. E. Richards knows the Notts and Derby coal-field very well, but is not so sure-footed when he gets away from it. He has, too, a gift of characterization: Mother Hubbard, her husband and her sons are all well drawn. Mr. Richards doesn't seem able to make up his mind how to spell "Absalom".

The note of reality in Mayette Meyneng's *The Broken Arc* (Cassell, 8s. 6d.) will convince readers that this first novel, like many others, is largely autobiographical. It is the story of a young French girl, who fell in love with her childhood friend, married him, and lost him almost immediately in the early days of the war. The book, written in a language not the

writer's native tongue, contains much promise. Those who want a picture of the youth of France immediately before her fall will find it in these moving pages.

If radio plays on biblical subjects turn attention to the Bible and make people read it for themselves, they are indeed worth while. But we must confess that to read a play such as the Rev. Hugh Ross Williamson's *Paul —A Bondslave* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) leaves us stone cold: we find in it neither the appeal of the *A.V.* nor any sense of drama: the characters seem wooden, and even Stephen speaks thus:

> Peace be to this house and all that dwell in it. I am sorry that I am late, but there was a case of sudden illness and my help was necessary.

One other point. Would the Paul who made such frequent use of figures of speech drawn from the races regard them as he does in Act I of this play?

James Bridie has earned his place in the front rank of contemporary dramatists, and another volume of his plays is welcome. *Plays for Plain People* (Constable, 10s.) contains "Lancelot", "Holy Isle", "Mr. Bolfry", "Jonah 3" (a new version of "Jonah and the Whale", a version of the same play for broadcasting), and "The Dragon and the Dove".

Mr. Wilfred Walters' *Happy and Glorious* (Pendulum Publications, 4s. 6d.) is a play first produced at the Gate Theatre in 1930, and since played in five London theatres, the United States, and the Dominions. Mr. Walters doesn't seem to know the difference between "check" and "cheque", and no Yorkshireman ever spoke like his Yorkshireman, but he has put thought into the play, and occasionally there are flashes of humour.

Our admiration for Mr. Harold Herd's competence and our respect for his previous writings increase the regret with which we feel his play, *Roman Road* (Fleet Publications, 6s.) is a flop. This is evidently not the medium in which Mr. Herd was meant to express himself: in his own person he can say what he has to say in the cause of freedom much better than through these puppets.

Dr. H. P. Van Dusen's *They Found the Church There* (S.C.M., 6s.) has for its sub-title "The Armed Forces discover Christian Missions": its motto may be said to be a sentence from the airman's letter to his mother: "Because of missions, I was feasted and not feasted upon when I fell from the sky into this village". Many American serving men have been led by their experiences to realize the value of the work done by Christian missions, and have shown their support in practical ways. Dr. Van Dusen has gathered together a stimulating collection of testimonies. Something has gone wrong with his dates on page 114, and to say that one month before America's entry into World War I "Japan and Britain sealed a secret compact to divide the spoils along the line of the Equator" seems a provocative over-simplification.

The American Church History Society is doing some very useful work (why is there no such Society in Britain?), and its new volume, Dr. Babette M. Levy's *Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History* (the Society, Hartford, Conn., $3.00), is an interesting and informing piece of work. From Robert Cushman's sermon at Plymouth in 1621 Dr. Levy deals with the sermons of some thirty-five preachers, examining the form as well as the content of the sermons, the style as well as the effect. There is a useful, though not a complete, bibliography, and the work is one of which the Society, and the author, can rightly be proud.

The higher critic will have a good time with a book called *The Third Day*

(Burns, 10s. 6d.). He will decide it is the work of several people, for Streeter is "H. H." and "B. H.", Montefiore "C. E." and "C. G.", and James "Moffat" and "Moffatt" (on consecutive pages). Some of the writers are clearly uneducated, for they cannot spell "discreet", use the strange form "phychologist", and quote a poem, "The *angles* keep their ancient places". It cannot be true that the whole is the work of one author, Mr. Arnold Lunn, who sets out to demolish modernists and higher critics, and to defend the orthodox doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus. No matter how much we agree with Mr. Lunn—and we always maintain that if Jesus is unique, there is no reason why His mode of entering and leaving the world should not be unique—we are obliged to state that his autobiographical Introduction is the best part of the book: there is much about *N.T.* scholarship with which Mr. Lunn is unfamiliar, and he rests too much on Ramsay and the Rylands fragment. Nevertheless all students of the *N.T.* and of Christian apologetics should be made to read these pages. Mr. Lunn is absolutely right in arguing that Christianity is too much on the defensive, that Christian apologetics should be taught, and Christians be ready to give account of the faith that is in them—and he never fails to be stimulating.

The Roman Catholic setting of the Rev. E. J. Edwards' *White Fire* (Burns, Oates, 8s. 6d.) should not deter Protestants from reading this story of a leper camp in the Philippines. The psychological as well as the physical problem presented by the lepers is well brought out, and not less so the devotion and self-sacrifice of the little community of Sisters who tend them. "Can prayer succeed in the cure of leprosy when even the most recent scientific treatment fails?"—this is the theme of the novel, which well deserves the attention of all interested in the question of the relationship of body, mind, and spirit.

Mr. A. W. Gomme's *Greece* in "The World of Today" series (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) is packed with information arranged in scholarly fashion, but it is mostly concerned with what might be called the Venezelist period. It dates too from about 1940, and—if travellers' reports be true and no country in Europe is so devastated as Greece—much of it must be out of date.

ALBERT PEEL.

Mr. Harry Roberts and Lord Horder confess to having had doubts about the title of their anthology, *The Philosophy of Jesus* (Dent, 5s.), and *The Sayings of Jesus* might have served better. After a discussion of Jesus' geographical and social environment and of Jesus' "philosophy" and character as a teacher, the editors print 70 pages of Jesus' sayings in the *A.V.*, under various headings. This is a book which may well quicken inquirers' interest in Jesus, but it is doubtful whether His sayings are made more easily intelligible by being deprived of their context. If only someone would write a book on Jesus' sayings, applying the criteria of authenticity usual in literary and æsthetic studies!

Bishop Reginald Pecock: A Study in Ecclesiastical History and Thought, by Mr. V. H. H. Green (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.), the Thirlwall Prize for 1941, well fills a gap which needed filling. Pecock, who wrote in English because in controversy with the Lollards, has been studied largely for his language; here, his work as a scholar, critic and theologian is considered and his significance for fifteenth-century religion estimated. Although his purpose was to defend the Church, his methods were condemned by authority as too rationalistic, and the bishop lost his see and almost his life. The book is carefully documented.

Those who desire to know more of the Greek Orthodox Church and her

piety should see *A Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers,* which have been translated by members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius (S.P.C.K., 4s. 6d.). The Calendar of the Eastern Church is also printed.

It is not necessary to accept Mr. Arthur Bryant's description of Mr. A. L. Rowse as "one of the greatest historians this country has ever produced" to enjoy Mr. Rowse's writing, and many besides those upon whom Cornwall exercises a special attraction will be glad to see his *West-Country Stories* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.). The "stories" include both fact and fiction; some have been published before, some have not. For Mr. Rowse "every journey homeward is a sentimental journey", and he is at his best when he allows free rein to "the instinctive turning of the exile's thoughts to his home".

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Church College and Nation (Cloister Press, $2.00), by Dr. G. R. Elliott, Professor of English in Amherst College, is a very interesting study of the relation between religion and education in the University colleges of America, and the bearing of that relation on the future of American nationality. Dr. Elliott speaks of the type of religion in American Universities today as a kind of collegiate Deism in which secular education has become quite separated from traditional Christian beliefs; and he says the time has come when "sheer self-interest if not higher motives should impel the college to co-operate with the church in bringing the Christian imagination to bear upon the undergraduates". "They must be lifted for religious purposes out of the academic atmosphere into the atmosphere of the church". How far the American Universities are like our own in this matter is a question; but the situations are not unlike one another, and there is much in this book which is of true concern to English readers. The methods Dr. Elliott has in mind and the precise forms of religious teaching he advocates may be open to criticism, but of the main points of the situation there is no doubt. This well-written book deals with a topic of first-rate importance.

Dr. J. Parton Milum's *Man and his Meaning* (Skeffington, 15s.), which is described as "a study of the human element in the Universe", is the kind of book one approaches with some disquiet. The author takes a bird's eye view of the universe, and of the troubled course of man's evolution. This occupies the first part of the book; in the second part we have the message of the Universe. This message "we take to be no other than the Christian revelation". But the message has been given in symbolic language, and the author feels that "the time is ripe for a fresh study of this symbolic language". There follows a new setting of old truths. Dr. Milum provides a wide bibliography to his separate chapters.

Mr. Hugh J. Schonfield's *By What Authority?* (Herbert Joseph, 6s.) is a study of internationalism. There is a very fair discussion to begin with of such matters as world unity, collective security, and federalism. The latter part of the book advocates a form of world citizenship, whose members become together a kind of new nation, or servant-state. Mr. Schonfield quotes at some length from Dr. Mackennal's remarkable address many years ago to the Free Churches at Sheffield on "The martyr nation", and what he appears to advocate is a kind of international body of world citizens, each keeping his own nationality, but working out the policy of this servant state. "Its real power", he says, "would be the power of example, the power of the spirit, to lead men not compel them into the paths of righteousness".

Dr. R. J. Smithson's *The Feast of Remembrance* (Pickering & Inglis, 2s. 6d.) is a short devotional study of Holy Communion. This is a beautiful little book, written with spiritual insight, and based on a clear theology of the Eucharist, but in no sense controversial. It should be of great help as a

preparation for the service, especially to first communicants. It is written without any false strain of emotion, and has behind it a sound Biblical scholarship and a real understanding. There are points one would emphasize differently, and perhaps the truth that the service is more than one of remembrance might have been made clearer. But the book has given me the kind of pleasure which puts criticism out of the field. It is, as I have already said, a beautiful little book. A. T. S. JAMES.

Prospect for Christendom (Faber, 12s. 6d.), a collection of essays edited by Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt, is the work of a group of people within the Church of England who, for more than a quarter of a century, have been working out the relevance of the Catholic doctrine of man and society to the problems and opportunities of the twentieth century. There are seventeen contributors, some of them of such high standing that the importance of the book is guaranteed even before it is opened. The work is not such a hotch-potch as collections of articles are apt to be, because the group has worked in close and prolonged consultation. Such adverse criticism as might be made is very largely forestalled by Mr. Reckitt in his introduction. If, he says, an attempt is made to suggest the shape of a Christian society one of two accusations is commonly brought forward. If the suggestions are related with any closeness to the conditions of any social structure which can be foreseen, they are denounced as "blue-prints". If, abjuring this, they portray a social order in vaguer outline, they are dismissed as Utopian. The authors could write these criticisms in advance; they could—and perhaps in due course they will—even write the answers to them. It is to be hoped they will. In the meantime the book certainly does what it sets out to do, which is not to say that readers will agree with all the theological positions which are taken up. The authors do not deal in vague generalities. They boldly tackle the question of Christian beliefs about such specific issues as agriculture and country life, town-planning, finance, and the machine. Probably nothing more complete of its kind has been attempted. In these days, when small value for good money is the frequent complaint of book-buyers, the publishers are to be congratulated on giving so much for 12s. 6d. It is to be feared, however, that the small print, which sometimes seems a little faint on the tinted paper, will be trying to some eyes and that the gratitude of at least a few readers will be diminished in consequence. L. J. TIZARD.

Prof. Oswald T. Allis's *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., $2.50) is an examination of *O.T.* prophecy from a standpoint largely determined by that of the Plymouth Brethren. The argument is based upon Fundamentalist principles, rejecting Modernism and Higher Criticism, and pleading for a more united stand on the part of Evangelicals against the assaults of scepticism and unbelief. Fundamentalists, it would appear, are not in agreement respecting the scope and application of prophecy. Dr. Allis himself takes the view of the writer of *Hebrews*, for whom the Church of the *N.T.* is heir to the prophetic promises, and he is therefore opposed to the so-called Dispensational claim that the prophecies concern Israel and Israel alone and are to find their fulfilment in a restoration of Judaism at the end of the Dispensation of the Church which is to be regarded as "a mystery parenthesis" interrupting the process of fulfilment. Hence he is led to discuss the various forms of Millenarianism as held by different groups of Fundamentalists. The book is well written and cogent enough for those who accept its presuppositions. But we are driven to ask, When Fundamentalists disagree, who is to judge between them? E. J. PRICE.

In *St. Philip Neri* (Sands, 6s. 6d.) Miss Doreen Smith tells clearly and convincingly the life story of an unconventional and lovable man who exercised a great influence over many people during his lifetime (1515-1595). St. Philip was blessed with much personal charm; this and the profound measure of the love of God in his heart were nourished in his hours of prayer and mortification. An Oratory grew out of his influence and habits. This was not a Religious Order but a "community of *secular* priests and clerics living together and sharing a common rule" but not bound by vows, nor had personal property to be given up. "Simplicity and Joy" were, and are, the "keynotes of Oratorian devotion". This book should challenge and inspire readers to more thorough and regular periods of prayer. It would make a suitable gift book. HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

Mr. Geoffrey Hoyland's *The Tyranny of Mathematics—An Essay in the Symbiosis of Science, Poetry and Religion* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.) contains three lectures on the domination of thought since Newton by the kind of analysis and synthesis which finds its most perfect expression in the differential and integral calculus, but also manifests itself in other spheres, *e.g.*, in historical criticism. It is argued that such analysis is a sieve that lets through so much that the subsequent synthesis can never be more than partial and imperfect. We have to look to poetry and religion for a total impression. Isaac Newton must be supplemented by Henry Vaughan and George Fox, each of whom in his own way saw God.

The thesis of the limitations of the analytic method is, no doubt, sound; and the lectures are witty and full of well-said things. But, naturally, they can be no more than a programme, which needs an immense amount of work to carry out, expand, and justify. The exact relation between the world of natural law and that of poetry and religion is hard to fix; as is also that between the spheres of historical criticism and religious faith. To come to the supreme instance, the total impression made by Jesus transcends the results of the historical criticism of the Gospels: nevertheless it cannot but be modified by whatever results we accept.

Where Mr. Hoyland's lectures are likely to be of use is that by their literary range and the smartness of their hits they may serve to call the attention of those obsessed with science and the scientific outlook to the fact that there are other important aspects of the universe. But why is the word "ellipse" spelt no less than five times with only one "l"? Is it a multiple printer's error? ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Part, at least, of the aim of Mr. G. W. Elderkin's *Golgotha, Kraneion and the Holy Sepulchre* (Pond-Ekberg Co., $1.75) is indicated by the author on p. 11: "The theory of the writer is that Hadrian found the cults of Aphrodite and of the Cretan Zeus on the sites which later were appropriated by Constantine as the scenes of the crucifixion and the burial". The author has collected a great deal of material concerning the ritual at shrines where worship of a god with taurine connections was practised, and brings out very clearly a number of striking parallels. But the very frequent—and certainly justified—use of the words "may have been" indicates that the wholesale identification of deities and cults here made is too theoretical to have much weight as yet, in spite of the vigorous campaigning of the Scandinavian school. Some of the author's explanations are certainly far-fetched; and his venture into the very uncertain field of druidic religion is not at all happy. Whilst interesting to the student of Mediterranean religious cults, this book as such has little contribution to make to the study of the Christian religion. D. R. AP-THOMAS.

Mr. Anthony Ireland's *Byron in Piccadilly* (Cape, 5s.), a play in three acts, dramatizes in simplified form the intricate story of the poet's life in England between the year of *Childe Harold* (1811) and his exile (1816). These are the years of triumph, both as poet and man, and of swift disaster, social, domestic and financial. It is not every historical dramatist who gives as an appendix to his play not only a bibliography of sources, but also a complete list of his departures from fact. Byron is represented as the man who *is* a hero to his valet, "gifted, courageous, noble-hearted", speaking often in the very words of his letters and diaries. For its faithfulness to original sources the play should prove salutary to those who still think of Byron as a cloven-footed monster, who managed to write half a dozen memorable stanzas, and made a glorious, if melodramatic, end.

P. A. SPALDING.

Private and Public Prayers (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), by the Rev. Wilton Rix, is well described as unusual in form and content and most suggestive for personal and corporate use. It is planned for a week with additional devotions for special occasions, but is ample in its provision for a month. Acknowledging a debt to *Preces Privatae*, each day begins with Adoration, passes to Praise for the Creation and Praise for the Gospel, moves through Penitence to Intercessions for the Church and the World, and ends with Supplication for Ourselves. The material is garnered from wide fields, liturgical and otherwise, and presented from a Free Church standpoint with deep biblical insights. This simple and rich volume is most warmly to be commended alike for private and public use.

In *The School Service* (R.E.P., 6s.) Miss Doris Starmer Smith has compiled a comprehensive and workmanlike set of orders of worship for use with pupils between 9 and 15. There are some 50 orders for all occasions, built up out of the compiler's own experience with the co-operation of pupils. But we could wish they had also the sure biblical insights of *Private and Public Prayers*.

A Service Book for Youth (R.E.P., 10d.), by Miss J. M. Macdougall Ferguson, contains responsive openings, Bible readings, litanies and services which should be useful in youth organizations.

KENNETH G. OGILVIE.

SMALL BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

THOSE who are interested in *Membership in the Society of Friends*, whether as Seekers or for purposes of comparison, will do well to study Horace B. Pointing's 9d. tract with this title (Friends' Book Centre), which is written with great delicacy. Horace Pointing has also written a pamphlet called *Art, Religion and the Common Life* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.), in which both art and religion are shown to be needed for the abundant life, despite the Puritan fear of art, which is described with full sympathy. Another Quaker booklet is *In Quietness*, by L. Violet Holdsworth (Friends' Book Centre, 2s. 6d.), an anthology of thoughts on silent worship, expressed in both prose and poetry. *The Nature of the Church according to the Witness of the Society of Friends* (F.B.C., 9d.) is a statement prepared by their Committee on Christian Relationships for presentation to the Commission on the Church set up by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, and is quite clear as to the nature of Quaker witness in this connexion. From Friends House also come Dr. Howard E. Collier's *Health and the Quaker Way of Life* (6d.), and a reprint of William Littleboy's *The Appeal of Quakerism to the Non-Mystic* (6d.). Three further local studies of L.M.S. work published in connexion with the Society's Triple Jubilee are a short history of the part played by Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire in the Society's foundation and work by the Rev. J. G. Patton, which has *The Triple Jubilee of the London Missionary Society, 1795-1945* as its main title (A. Brown & Sons, Ltd., 3s. 6d.); a Northumbrian Souvenir, called *Faith's Transcendent*

Dower, edited by Lilian Boag (Doig Bros. & Co., Ltd., 53 Stowell Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 6d.); and *L.M.S. in Reading: 1795-1945*, compiled by Megan Lewis Thomas (Bradley & Son Ltd., Reading, 6d.). The collected reports of the Society's work in the Telugu Church Council area of the South India United Church for 1941-4 is now available under the title *God's Building*. Two recent studies of one of the most ugly of modern problems are Dr. James Parkes's *An Enemy of the People: Antisemitism* (Penguin, 9d.), which provides the history of Antisemitism from 1873 onwards, and studies its psychology and sociology, as well as means by which it may be eliminated; and Mr. A. C. F. Beales' *The Pope and the Jews* (Sword of the Spirit, 9d.), which describes "the struggle of the Catholic Church against Anti-Semitism during the War". In *The Shattered Cross* (Berean Press, 2s. 6d.) Principal W. Robinson reprints articles from *The Christian Advocate* which describe the different branches of the Church, with special attention to the Disciples. It is a useful survey, but is not always accurate in its facts (*e.g.*, Baxter was not a Congregationalist) or correct in its denominational phraseology. Also by a Disciple is Mr. James Gray's *Individual Salvation is not Enough* (Christian Action Fellowship of the Churches of Christ, 6d.), a plea for the application of Christianity to social, economic and political affairs. The Rev. T. Wigley's *Christianity and the Modern Need—a Modernist Approach* (Modern Churchmen's Union and Union of Modern Free Churchmen, 6d.) shows the contempt for classical philosophy too often characteristic of this wing. Nos. 4 and 5 of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen's Pamphlets on Religion, Life and Thought are Professor T. E. Jessop's *Reason and Religion: a Plea for a Rational Faith*, and Professor Herbert Dingle's *Science and Religion*, in which the causes of their conflict and their common ground are considered (6d. each). *Tales from the L.M.S.*, by Miss Joyce Reason (L.P., 4s.), aims to give children, through a selection of stories, a general impression of the Society's achievements and future tasks. The book is well written, attractively produced, and splendidly achieves its aim. Five further publications from Livingstone Press are *Let's Play Games*, by Miss Bertha C. Krall (9d.), in which British and Overseas games are described and suggestions made as to their use in support of a missionary lesson or story; *Eagle Omnibus No. 3* (2s. 6d.), which contains Eagle Books numbers 13-18; *Christmas Candles*, by Miss Beryl Brown (3d.), which is a short Nativity Play, topical in character, in which children from North, South, East, and West meet; and *Other People's Shoes*, by Miss Mary H. Debenham (4d.), which introduces as much information as can be expected, without any feeling of overloading, in a play which is timed to last for 45 minutes. In Practical Books, No. 5, *Overseas at Home*, by Miss Winifred Warr (2s.), the early chapters are devoted to: (i) Stories and how to tell them; (ii) Games and how to teach them; (iii) Models and how to create them; (iv) Drama and how to plan it. Information is then given how these may be used as the media for educating children in "friendly and sympathetic appreciation of other lands and people". This book should be of much value to all workers among youth. The contributors to the *Junior Club Handbook* (R.E.P., 3s. 6d.) have practical experience in the subjects on which they write. This comprehensive handbook is sponsored by the Under 14's Committee, and will be of invaluable assistance to all engaged in club work among the under 14's. The National Society and S.P.C.K. are publishing for the Anglican Young People's Association a series under the general title "Unto a Full-Grown Man". These volumes are for use by people met for corporate meditation of a positive character. In view of the subjects dealt with, this method (which is fully explained) is a marked improvement on those of a study circle. In Vol. V, *Church History* (3s. 6d.), Mrs. Caroline M. Duncan-Jones devotes sections (i), (ii) and (iii) to a selection of incidents representative of the story of the Church to and including the Reformation. Section (iv) tells the story of the Anglican Church only, from the Reformation to the present day. Can a true picture of the Anglican Church be given which ignores (as this section virtually does) the witness of Nonconformity to the nature of the Church and its contribution to the religious life of England? This question aside, here is a helpful volume. The Editors, Mr. S. H. Evans and Mr. E. W. Southcott, have prepared the frameworks of active meditation in which Mrs. Duncan-Jones' "Pictures" of Church History are set. The *Young People's Concise Guide for 1946*, edited by Mr. Ernest Hayes (R.E.P., 4s. 6d.), suggests that these guides maintain their high standard and will be of real service to teachers. If the Historical Association sets out to correct *Common Errors in History* (1s.) it should avoid confident generalizations. In denying that there was religious freedom in New England, Plymouth, Massachusetts, and Connecticut are lumped all together, and the only authority mentioned is the *Cambridge History of the British Empire*. Some of the other "corrections", *e.g.*, that on "The Manchurian Crisis, 1931-32", seem to be lacking in objectivity: this might almost have been written by Lord Simon. Nelson's Practical Work Books maintain a high standard, and Mr. Julian Mockford's *Union of South Africa* (1s.) will be found useful. Dr. Christopher Wilson's Signpost Booklet, *One African Colony* (1s.) deals with Kenya.

ALSO RECEIVED

G. B. Caird and John Huxtable. *The Church and its Witness.* Livingstone & Independent Presses. 6d.

T. Ashbridge. *Why Revival Tarries.* Pickering & Inglis. 1s. 6d. A plea for more prayer and personal consecration.

A. R. Wiggins. *Father of Salvation Army Music.* Salvation Army. 2s. The life of Richard Slater.

Mary Entwistle. *Stories of the Boy Jesus.* R.E.P. 5s. "For teachers and parents".

Bertha Krall. *Other Stories Jesus Heard.* R.E.P. 3s. 18 *O.T.* stories for children uniform with *Stories Jesus Heard.*

Our Princess Elizabeth in Pictures. 52 pictures. Alliance Press. 1s. 3d.

Thomas B. Rees. *His Touch Has Still Its Ancient Power.* Pickering. 3s. 6d. Stories of conversions at the present day.

Mervyn Stockwood. *Services for Children.* S.C.M. 2s. 6d. 39 Orders of Service, the last one being for "The Enthronement of the Boy Bishop".

E. O. Payne. *Music in the School Assembly.* R.E.P. 2s. 6d.

H. Wheeler. *This Thing called History.* Macdonald. 6s. "History is the oratorio of humanity".

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

People Matter (S.C.M., 6s.) is one of the best series of talks for which the Religious Department of the B.B.C. has been responsible. In Prof. Norman H. Snaith the Department has found a broadcaster who not merely has something to say but also knows how to say it. The Bishop of Gloucester's Diocesan Address, *The Holy Catholic Church* (Blackwell, 2s.) summarizes the views Dr. Headlam has long expounded. He still speaks of Wesleyans, and the old dogmatism still reappears; opponents are easily disposed of: "Dr. Major thinks . . . That is not so"; "Dr. Inge says . . . That is a mistake". Dr. A. D. Lindsay's Founders' Memorial Day Lecture at Girton, *The Good and the Clever* (Cambridge Press, 1s. 6d.) is a readable plea that goodness and cleverness should not be regarded as alternatives, but combined, so that goodness involves readiness to act with a will that is rational. Prof. F. M. Powicke's British Academy appreciation of A. J. Carlyle (Oxford Press, 2s.) is freshly written. Rather surprisingly it omits any reference to the volume *Christianity in History*, which Carlyle wrote in collaboration with J. Vernon Bartlet. Prof. E. L. Woodward's *Some Political Consequences of the Atomic Bomb* (Oxford Press, 2s.) drives home as well as anything we have read the possible effects on civilization of the atomic bomb.

Albert Peel.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (October). The aphorisms in Dr. Jacks' "Food for Thought" deal with atomic energy, and they are themselves explosive. Readable articles discuss Sydney Smith and Victor Hugo, while D. G. Leibholz examines "Two Types of Democracy". Dr. Hilda Oakeley's "The Redemption of International Relations" is suggestive. Dr. Mellone surveys philosophical and theological literature.

Baptist Quarterly (July-October). Tributes to Wheeler Robinson are paid by Dr. Grieve and Dr. T. H. Robinson. The Rev. B. G. Collins writes on "Shakespeare's Religion", the Rev. R. A. Ward on "Aristotelian Terms in the *N.T.*", Dr. W. T. Whitley on "The Family Business at Nazareth", Dr. R. F. Aldwinckle (usefully) on "From Man to God", Dr. T. G. Dunning on "A Baptist Oxford Movement", and the Rev. Percy Austin on the remarkable spread of Baptist Churches from Barton-in-the-Beans.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). A number packed with interesting articles, of which we put first Caroline C. Graveson's "Some Reminiscences of Bobby and Melodrama" and the Bishop of Lichfield's broadcast on Elizabeth Fry. Pasteur X's "The Church in Alsace during the Occupation" is informing, John A. Kay's "Friends' Work in Le Havre" disquieting.

Expository Times (October-November). Prof. John Foster continues "Decline and Recovery". A new series, "Reconciliation and Reality", is opened by the Rev. J. R. Coates and continued by Miss K. M. Tanqueray. Dr. D. S. Cairns writes on "The Instability of Theism".

Modern Churchman (September). This issue contains the papers read on "The Religion the World Needs" at the Annual Conference, and it would be a good thing if all theological colleges would make it the basis for a term's seminar discussions. From Sir Cyril Norwood's opening address to Dr. Inge's "Retrospect and Prospect", the papers have much that is searching to say—and notably the first address already mentioned, Dr. St. John Ervine's "God and My Neighbour", and "Christian Education" by Mr. Samuel Cookey, a West African who has become a Quaker and who declares that the attitude of the educated West African to religion is precisely the same as that of the educated Englishman. Dr. St. John Ervine apparently believes that there were Puritans in Massachusetts in the 16th century.

Church Quarterly Review (October). An astounding number, redeemed by an informing article on the Inquisition by Mr. F. D. S. Darwin. The Bishop of Gloucester's "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians" is a violent onslaught on Dr. P. N. Harrison and B. H. Streeter, the Rev. A. W. Ballard's "Laud: A Vindication" eloquent pamphleteering, and Mr. J. M. Cunningham's "A Hundred Years Ago" an interesting article on Anglicanism in the West Riding by a writer who prints the long "s" in his documents as "f". Principal William Robinson's "Dogma, Theology and History" takes a line common today, while the Bishop has another outburst in "The Future: War or Peace".

International Review of Missions (October). A valuable number, with perhaps the Rev. G. L. B. Sloan's disquieting "The Missionary to the Jews in Palestine Today" the outstanding article. The Rev. F. Balchin's "The Place of the Missionary in the Chinese Church" is by a Congregational missionary now on furlough. Dr. C. S. Smith's "Theological Education in China" outlines progress—or the reverse—during the last twenty years. The review section is useful, notably in reviews of American books not published on this side, but some of them are of disproportionate length—a volume on *Co-operative Living in Palestine* surely does not deserve more space than Dr. Latourette's final volume, which only gets as much as a popular sketch of the history of the L.M.S.

World Dominion (September-October). Mr. J. D. Rockefeller, Jnr., on "What of the Future?", Dr. J. R. Temple on "Can Europe Recover?", and the Bishop of Rochester on "Towards the Conversion of England" open, and then the number visits China, New Guinea and the Congo, and concludes with the Rev. A. Stuart McNairn's "What is Denominationalism?".

Religion in Life (Autumn). A good number, with the theological element predominating, articles on "Liberal Concessions to Fundamentalism", "New Testament Study and Theology" (with an estimate of Dr. C. H. Dodd's contribution), and "The Re-birth of Theology" being well worth perusal.

Bulletin of John Rylands Library (July). Dom Romanus Rios recounts the history of Monte Cassino. Dr. David Daube criticizes Torrey's thesis *re* an Aramaic origin of the Gospels, Dr. J. R. H. Moorman finds much to praise in William Laud, and Dr. Edward Robertson describes new aspects of the problem of the Pentateuch.

Anglican Theological Review (July). Mr. John S. Marshall contributes a thoughtful study of "Hooker's Theory of Church and State". Mr. Arthur Jeffery reprints three documents on the history of Christianity in South Arabia.

Harvard Theological Review (July). Prof. C. C. McCown's "In History or Beyond History" is a searching study of the conception of history held by representatives of dialectical theology and Neo-Orthodoxy, in which some of Dr. C. H. Dodd's contentions are scrutinized. The rest of the issue is given to the Rev. Arnold Ehrhardt's *"Vir Bonus Quadrato Lapidi Comparatur"*.

Review and Expositor (July). Ministers will find the first three articles of service—Prof. H. E. Luccock's "What Literature can do for a Preacher", Dr. S. L. Morgan's "A New Minister for a New Day", and Dr. J. S. Bonnell's "The Art of Listening".

Yale Review (Autumn). A valuable number, with the political articles outstanding. Mr. John Chamberlain's "President Truman's Job", Mr. Walter Millis' "The United Nations Charter and the Peace", Mr. Richard Hooker's "Japan's Lost Opportunity in the War", Mr. R. J. Kerner's "Russian Policy in the Far East", and most of all Mr. W. B. Willcox's "The Future in Reference to American Naval Power" should all be studied.

A. P.